

small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6677. Also, petition of Mr. J. I. Hegge and 45 others, of Mad-dock, N. Dak., petitioning for the enactment of emergency legislation to stabilize the price of farm products to a level more nearly equal to the price that the farmer has to pay for articles which he purchases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, December 23, 1922.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the angels' song of peace and good will to men, and we long for the time when that peace and good will shall be realized in human hearts and lives, that men shall understand one another and man to man be true as a brother. We long to see the time when war and its desolating and destructive influences shall cease and nations shall learn war no more. O for the coming of those thousand years pledged.

And we do ask Thee that this day our hearts may be gladden-ed by the thought that each one of us can be the minister of peace and good will to tried and sad hearts, as well as to the children and youth of our day. We ask in Christ Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Over-hue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines;

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askeli;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case;

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is in receipt of a communication from the Governor of the State of Connecticut, transmitting the certificate of election of GEORGE P. MCLEAN

as a Senator of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which will be read and placed on file.

The certificate was read and ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, GEORGE P. MCLEAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Everett J. Lake, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 20th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

EVERETT J. LAKE, Governor.
DONALD J. WARNER, Secretary.

SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was absent from the Senate Chamber yesterday, and he may be absent for several days. He was called away on a message informing him of the serious illness of a member of his family. He wished me to announce his absence in the event a vote was taken. I believe there was no vote taken yesterday, but as unanimous consent was asked and agreed to, to which possibly he might have objected had he been present, I wish the RECORD to show his necessary absence on yesterday, and the reason for it.

DEFLATION POLICY OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Wall Street Journal addressed 12 questions to me regarding the deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board. I answered those questions, and the questions and answers have been printed in the Wall Street Journal. I ask to have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SENATOR HEFLIN REPLIES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY.
October 3, 1922.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for printing in the Wall Street Journal of September 26, my letter to you of September 12, in which I believe I exploded the claim of ex-Governor Harding of the Federal Reserve Board, which had been printed in your columns, that:

"The Federal reserve banks in acquiring building sites and constructing bank buildings were making capital expenditures, consequently these operations do not diminish in any way the amount of franchise taxes payable to the United States Government."

I gave you figures which showed that the reserve banks had for the years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 charged off over \$10,000,000 for alleged depreciation in bank buildings, most of which were as yet unfinished, and had also charged against net earnings about \$4,000,000 more for furniture, equipment, vaults, etc.; but my statement was over-conservative, for I omitted important "charge offs" in the calendar year 1921, which would have brought the total of such charges against net earnings and profits up to more than \$15,500,000. As a result of those bookkeeping entries the Federal Government was plainly robbed of many millions of dollars to which it was entitled, despite ex-Governor Harding's unwarranted assertion that the cost of land and buildings were "capital expenditures" and that "these operations do not diminish in any way" the franchise taxes due the Government.

You suggest that—

"Granting that the outlays for land and new buildings were right, sound banking and bookkeeping made these depreciation charge offs against earnings equally proper."

I know of no one who can defend the monstrous outlays which I and others criticized and condemned or who can show that either the expenditure or the charge offs were "proper." The absurdity and unfairness of the reserve bank methods of escaping payment to the Government of franchise taxes was well illustrated in the case of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, which purchased property in 1918 at a cost of \$2,938,000, declared in the annual report for the same year that the old buildings were "not regarded as being of any value," but before the new buildings were completed the bank had charged off for alleged "depreciation" the sum of \$3,024,062, a portion of which was charged against net earnings and a portion charged against "supersurplus."

BANK OF ENGLAND'S SITE.

I note your excuse that the "Bank of England" has written down to nil its valuable site in the city of London; but this has been done in the course of 100 years or more, and let me remind you that the expenditures in connection with the New York Reserve Bank's banking edifices have been on such a scale that I understand that the amount paid out for commissions, fees, rake-offs of one kind or another to "architects, contractors, and engineers" in connection with that building exceed the total cost of both land and buildings of the great Bank of England, that classic structure so familiar to the banking world.

You ask that I answer for you 12 questions which you print, and I am pleased to comply with your request.

"First. Under the bank act, with limitation of dividends, are not the surplus earnings of the Federal reserve banks in effect the property of the people?"

Ninety per cent of the surplus earnings of the reserve banks, after the payment of 6 per cent dividends, belongs to the Government, are "in effect the property of the people," and when those earnings are reduced by extravagance and by improper bookkeeping entries the people are robbed.

"Second. Is not the main function of the Federal reserve system the sound underpinning of the whole financial structure?"

The main functions of the reserve system are to provide a scientific and effectual mobilization of bank reserves; to furnish a safe and elastic circulating medium; to furnish credit to member banks for the legitimate needs of those banks; and the country's business of all kinds impartially and promptly. If those banks are to have an "underpinning" of extravagance, extortion, favoritism, and incompetency, instead of being supported on the foundation stones of frugality, conservatism, impartiality, and broad statesmanship, the system is doomed.

REAL ESTATE AGAINST RENT.

"Third. Is it not sounder financial building to put surplus banking earnings into building construction, if rental charges against expenses are thereby reduced, than to use them in National Government expenditures?"

It is sound policy within certain limitations for a bank to own its banking house and thereby reduce its rental charges. But the official records show that no such excuse can be offered to justify the stupendous extravagance displayed by the reserve banks in the cases under discussion. This question is further covered in my answer to your question No. 10.

"Fourth. Can you divide the capital and accumulated surplus of an institution and say which part has been put into the construction of a building except as a matter of bookkeeping?"

The Reserve Bank of New York in December, 1919, when the preliminary contract was given to contractors for its palatial banking quarters (originally estimated to cost about \$30,000,000 and by subsequent estimate, in March, 1921, as shown in board's report to Senate October 31, 1921, reduced to \$25,646,000), reported its paid-in capital at \$22,387,000, and its surplus at that time, arising from the change in the Federal reserve act which enabled a reserve bank to accumulate a surplus equal to 200 per cent of its paid-in capital before paying franchise taxes to the Government, was \$32,229,000. The cost of the building which it was proceeding to erect was therefore equivalent to 115 per cent of its capital, or approximately 50 per cent of the combined capital and surplus. It is immaterial whether the amount invested in banking houses is assigned to capital or to surplus.

"Fifth. Is not the substitution of building construction for rents a sound underpinning for the whole financial structure?"

The substitution of building construction for rents is not sound but a very rotten "underpinning" for the financial structure, when the yearly cost or output for its banking house is multiplied 500 per cent and more by such expenditure, and when these additional costs may involve impairment of the bank's surplus, if not of its capital. Some of the reserve banks, I am informed, are already operating at a deficit and are not making their dividends as a result of their gross extravagance, reckless management, and reduced earnings.

A QUESTION OF SERVICE.

"Sixth: Is not the soundness of the Federal reserve system, the increase of its facilities and abilities to serve the public, and the reduction of rental charges against earnings in the interest of the people and their business?"

If a reduction of rental charges against earnings is "in the interest of the people and their business," the converse of that proposition suggests that such a reckless increase in housing costs as has been exposed may be regarded as distinctly against the public interest.

"Seventh: Is it anything more than a question of business judgment as to the proportion of capital or income that shall be put into buildings?"

The monstrous expenditures which have been sanctioned and are now under way, for the erection of banking palaces for some of the reserve banks, have been on such a scale that not the "judgment" but the good faith and sanity of the men who have authorized and directed some of these expenditures has been seriously brought into question. A doctor whose "judgment" impelled him to administer a dozen grains of strychnine to a patient, when only a small fraction of a grain was justified, would probably be either hung or sent to an insane asylum.

A leading and distinguished citizen of one of our large eastern cities recently declared in regard to these exposures concerning the reserve banks:

"If you think the Tweed Ring in their days and ways was any comparison with the Federal Reserve Board transaction, you misapprehend the size.

"I lived in those days, and I remember their sensations, which were tame when compared with these.

"If only the same men who got after Tweed could get after these, they would prove an ornament to the generation and have a life estate that would perpetuate the recollections.

"Then the sufferance was in one State, confined to the city of New York; now the dominion is vast, broadcast throughout the United States."

I am told that the money which it was planned to spend on the banking quarters of the New York Reserve Bank was twice as much as the "Tweed Ring" was charged with squandering in connection with the construction of the old notorious county court house in New York City.

WHO IS THE LOSER?

"Eighth. Might it not better be assumed that what is paid in taxes by the Federal reserve system is lost to the people and its Federal reserve system than to declare that building sites and bank buildings are 'actual losses which the Government has sustained?'"

It might be assumed, but it would be a false assumption. Every dollar of franchise taxes paid into the Treasury by the reserve banks reduces to that extent the amount of taxes to be paid by the people.

When money which would otherwise go into the Public Treasury is squandered on big palaces owned by the banks and not by the Government the Government is plainly the loser.

"Ninth. How can the Government or the people sustain an 'actual loss' by the substitution of construction for expenditure?"

The people did, for example, sustain an actual loss of over \$6,000,000 when a few reserve banks charged against the expenses for alleged "depreciation" in bank buildings, not yet completed, over \$7,000,000, over 90 per cent of which, or, say, \$6,000,000, would have been paid into the Federal Treasury as franchise taxes. The Government has been deprived of millions more by their unwarranted charges made against earnings by the bank.

The people of this country also consider that the Government was unjustifiably deprived of revenues, and that public moneys were squandered when the 12 reserve banks increased their salary lists from \$4,768,449 in 1918 to \$19,478,250 in 1921. The board's report to the Senate also shows that one of these banks—the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—raised the salaries of about one-half of its 40 officers to more than 500 per cent of the aggregate of the salaries which they were receiving immediately before, or at the time of, their first employment by the reserve system. The official reports show that the salary of one of those 40 officers was raised to 737 per cent of the salary received immediately before employment by the reserve bank. Another was raised to 733 per cent; two more were raised to 694 per cent; and two other officers were advanced to 520 per cent of their old pay. Another was jumped to 454 per cent, and still another to 480 per cent of the salary which he was receiving about the time of his first employment by the bank. The record of a young man, originally employed by the reserve system at \$3,000 as a law clerk, who was without practical banking experience, never having been employed by any bank as far as I can learn before going to the Reserve Bank of New York, but who had, in addition to his legal work, been frequently used by the Reserve Board as a lobbyist at the Capitol, was not long since rewarded by being made deputy governor of the New York reserve banks at a salary of \$25,000 a year.

BETTER TO BUILD THAN SPEND.

"Tenth. Is it not better for an institution as well as an individual to build rather than to spend—to substitute a home for rents?"

According to the reserve board's reports to Congress, the total amount paid in rents in 1918 by four of the reserve banks, when business in their most important departments was far

larger than it is now, or than it is likely to be for years to come, was \$262,879, and in 1920, when rents were generally at their maximum, those same banks paid \$590,109 for rents. Do you suggest that it is better and more economical to substitute for annual rentals of \$262,879, or even \$590,109, the expenditure of \$49,878,914, which the board authorized those four particular banks to squander on their banking palaces upon which city taxes (if taxed at cost) and upkeep are alone estimated at over \$1,500,000 a year, and the interest on the money so locked up at only 3 per cent per annum would amount to over \$1,500,000 additional? If the business interests of the country generally should be conducted on any such basis as that, the country would soon become bankrupt. The money employed in those buildings would not have been taxable if loaned out on commercial or agricultural paper.

"Eleventh. Are not the post-office buildings a proper charge against postal receipts?"

No. Under our laws the Postmaster General could not use as much as \$25,000 of post-office receipts to build a post office in any town or city, however greatly it might be needed, without special act of Congress. But until the reserve act was changed last winter—and I helped to have it changed—the reserve board and the reserve banks could spend any amount they pleased on banking palaces, and did actually authorize the expenditure of \$25,646,410 for banking quarters for the Reserve Bank of New York alone. Furthermore, preliminary contracts for the monument of extravagance were let in December, 1919, about the very time that the New York Reserve Bank, as the records show, was borrowing from other reserve banks in different parts of the country over \$100,000,000, and about the time that the Federal Reserve Board actually suspended its reserve requirements to aid the New York Reserve Bank, which in making huge loans to big speculative institutions had, in the opinion of conservative and well-informed bankers, trampled upon the most elementary precepts of prudence and sound banking. I can furnish particulars, if you want them for the information of the public.

"Twelfth. Does Senator HEFLIN approve of the post office paying large rents to private owners of property or running in debt for building construction? If not, is there any other prudent course to pursue than building construction and amortization of the cost from earnings?"

That depends upon circumstances and upon your definition of "large." Rentals of even \$590,109 for four banks certainly and very obviously would not justify an expenditure of \$49,878,914 for new buildings in order to avoid the payment of that rental.

I have answered frankly and, I think, fully the 12 questions which you propounded to me and printed in your columns of September 23, and I will thank you to publish my reply at your earliest convenience.

J. THOS. HEFLIN.

AN INJUSTICE TO THE SOUTH.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Thursday the Senate confirmed the nomination of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and the nominations of certain members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that south of the line drawn from Baltimore to San Francisco, which embraces the entire South and one-half of the country, there is no member on the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and other commissions. I do not refer to this matter in any partisan or sectional spirit. I am sure that the Senators know that I have never uttered one word since I have been a Member of this body that would lead to partisan or sectional debate. I have given all my time to the important work of the Senate.

During the last administration I protested against the injustice done the South in the matter of these appointments. I do not expect the South to get many desirable political appointments, except those purely local, under this administration, and I have not tried in any way to influence the appointments for these positions nor do I intend to. I realize that the most desirable positions are given to the States which furnished votes for the election of President Harding, but I do think that on account of the conditions peculiar to our section we should have just representation on the Supreme Court, Interstate Commerce Commission, and other commissions.

The Supreme Court is the very foundation stone of our Government, and every section, regardless of politics, should have its fair representation. The commercial conditions in the South are different from other sections, and it is all the more important that we should have representation on the Interstate

Commerce Commission, which fixes the rates for freight and passengers.

Until two years ago, when I joined several Senators and succeeded in getting the rates lowered from the Southeast, the railroad rates fixed by the commission from the Middle West to the southeastern ports were higher than to the eastern ports and discriminated against the Southeast. We protested against this injustice, and the commission lowered the rates to make them fair to all sections.

The South is discriminated against in the matter of ocean freight rates on cotton and other products. I have urged, and will continue to urge, that this injustice to the South be remedied. I have discussed this matter with several Senators on the other side of the Chamber—Republicans—and they agree that it is a great injustice to the South and should not remain so.

The South has for years been taxed many millions annually by the protective tariff. Our principal production, cotton, is exported and received no protection from the Government, while we must compete with the pauper labor of the world in producing it.

Our country has suffered in many ways from such injustice on the part of our Government. I am proud of the fact that there is no more loyal section of the United States than in all the territory I have referred to from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. It is the one section of our country where the President of the United States can go without any secret agents or bodyguards to protect him, and he is absolutely safe from all harm and danger, no matter what his politics may be.

In the Spanish-American War—I hope I may be pardoned for referring to the fact—Georgia, the State I have the honor in part to represent, sent more soldiers to the war, compared with her population, than any State in the Union. In the World War our section certainly did its full duty and always will. The danger to this country in the future will not come from the South, but from other sections.

Mr. President, I am sure that the records made by southern men in these important positions met with the approval of all the people of our entire country regardless of politics. To-day in the South there are men suitable for these positions who are the equal of Justice L. Q. C. Lamar, Chief Justice White, Justice Joseph R. Lamar, and others who made such a splendid record as members of the Supreme Court, and it is conceded by all that Judson C. Clements was one of the ablest and best men who ever served on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Some days ago I wrote President Harding a letter, which I asked to be placed in the RECORD, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, November 29, 1922.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to request your consideration of the vast section known as the South in connection with the appointments being made to fill vacancies on the United States Supreme Court and various Federal commissions. Recently two appointments have been made to the Supreme Court by naming citizens from Utah and Minnesota.

I have no desire to present any appeal from a sectional standpoint, but I feel that the people of the South should have representation on some of the courts and commissions through citizens who have a knowledge of their customs, needs, and economic relations to the whole country.

It is my information that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have a single commissioner in its membership who comes from the entire section south of a straight line drawn from Maryland to California. The Federal Trade Commission has no member from the southern section.

I do not seek to secure any political consideration for any particular person, and I have no aspirants to suggest, but I know you will agree with me that the South can furnish splendid men with excellent knowledge of governmental and public affairs.

With high esteem, I am, very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. HARRIS.

GREAT PEE DEE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, in behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, S. C., and I submit a report (No. 963) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to the bill.

Mr. DIAL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment was to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the counties of Marlboro and Darlington be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Great Pee Dee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and at or near Society Hill, in Darlington County, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE COTTON-GROWING INDUSTRY.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning contains an article from the Associated Press giving the amount of cotton exported for the month of November, and the amount consumed by the spinners of the United States for that month. The total exportation and home consumption amounts to 1,435,878 bales of cotton. At this rate of consumption by our spinners and including also the amount of exports, it would require nearly 2,000,000 bales of cotton more than the Government says the present crop will be. The Government estimates that the present crop will be less than 10,000,000 bales.

Texas is the largest cotton-producing State in the Union, and the commissioner of agriculture of that State has said that it costs about 25 cents a pound to produce the present crop for the State of Texas. I submit in the face of the fact that we have a crop too small to meet the world's demands, and in the face of the fact that it costs 25 cents a pound to produce it, that three-fourths of this crop has already gone out of the hands of the producer at a price less than 25 cents a pound. Much of it has been sold at unprofitable prices to the producer. There is only about one-fourth of it remaining in the hands of the producers and the price is now about 26 cents a pound.

There is no justification or excuse for the present price. The bear speculators are in control of the market and they are depressing the price and by their manipulation holding the price down which to-day, if the law of supply and demand was permitted to operate, would be 30 cents a pound and above.

I simply wanted to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country so that they may know of this deplorable situation. Something has got to be done to enable the farmer of the South to produce cotton at a profit. If he had to-day a credit system under which he could borrow money on his cotton and hold it off the market, he could force the price up to 30 cents a pound. He could force it to a figure that would yield a profit. But not having a credit system responsive to the needs of agriculture he is at the mercy of the bear gamblers of Wall Street, who are to-day forcing cotton out of his hands at a price barely covering the cost of production, and after they get the cotton into their hands it will go to 30 cents a pound and perhaps higher. The speculator and foreign spinner will reap the benefit while the producer is robbed of the fruits of his toil. Senators, this situation is outrageous and indefensible. Something must be done before this Congress adjourns to free our distressed cotton producers from the clutches of market crooks and bear speculators. The business of the cotton producer must be put upon a sound and prosperous basis.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

A bill (S. 4230) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Boulder, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 4231) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Brighton, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

STATISTICS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce came over from the House a short time ago with some minor amendments, and I intended to move to concur in those amendments, but the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] desired that the bill go to conference, so that he could investigate it. He made the investigation and has no objection to it. So the conference report was returned to the Senate. The House has acted upon it, and I ask that the conference report may be acted upon at this time.

The report was read and agreed to as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

W. L. JONES,
KNUTE NELSON,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. FORDNEY,
W. R. GREEN,
W. C. HAWLEY,
JNO. N. GARNER,
J. W. COLLIER,

Managers on the part of the House.

THE CHRISTMAS SPIRIT.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Christmas season is at hand and we are about to adjourn for the observance of Christmas Day. On that subject, I have a brief article from the Christian Observer, of Louisville. In this time of strife, contention, and unrest all over the world, when everybody is seeking peace and contentment and so many are not finding those things, I believe this to be an appropriate time to read the article in question, as expressive of a true sense of appreciation of the spirit of the occasion and as pointing the only true path to peace and remedy for unrest. With the indulgence of the Senate I shall read it:

CHRISTMAS—THE PINNACLE OF THE YEAR.

"Christmas is the pinnacle of the year. No normal heart in a land of light can completely escape the contagion of the Christmas spirit. Society, business, church, and home—all come under the spell of its mystic power. Like a great white flower, rich with foliage red and green, the Christmas season bursts through the snows of midwinter and fills the land with the fragrance of kindness and with the beauty of happiness.

"There is a bit of magic in the air on Christmas Day. There is something that makes folk smile, whether they are wont to smile or not. There is unheard music that throbs in people's very pulses and warms their hearts and gladdens their countenances. There seems to be a bit more of Heaven in the earth. Yes, that is just it—there is more of Heaven in the earth! The Babe of Bethlehem is in the thoughts of men, and the angels' song is echoing in their ears. Let the joy bells ring!

"The birth of the blessed Jesus compels humanity's acclaim. The angels could not be silent when the manger of Bethlehem cradled Him; neither can men be silent when the circling year brings round the season of His advent. With shepherds and Magi and heavenly heralds, we must burst into praise. 'For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.' Mankind's chiefest need is the need of a Prince. Humanity's most pathetic want is the want of peace. Let the star shine far, and the angels' song be caroled in every land and tongue! For the Virgin's Child is the hope of the world!

"The world needs the Christmas spirit. For the Christmas spirit is a spirit of human brotherhood—'Peace on earth; good will among men!' For 2,000 years the proclamation has echoed in the skies. How long, O Lord, ere it shall echo in the hearts of nations, in the halls of state, and in the parliament of man? Let not hope and courage fail. The war clouds still are red, but the Prince of Peace must triumph. Had the carol of the heavenly host found a truer echo in the lives of professing Christians, His coming had not been so long delayed.

"Every community needs the Christmas spirit. For Christmas is a festival of friendship and cheerful generosity. It is the season of God's greatest gift to men. None can enter into the real joy of Christmas without giving. They find the sweetest joy who give to those who can make no return. Such giving partakes most truly of the spirit of Him who gave gifts unto men, and who said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'

"Every home needs the spirit of Christmas. For the spirit of Christmas is a spirit of love and tender thoughtfulness; it

is a spirit of self-forgetfulness, and the happy giving of one's self, in gentle ministries, to those with whom one lives. That is the spirit that creates a home. Jesus has taught us the spiritual secrets that make happy home life possible. He has sanctified wedlock and revealed the glory that belongs to childhood. Our ideal of the home has not come out of a king's palace or a lordly mansion, but out of a stable and a carpenter's cot. Christmas is the high carnival of the home. It is the season for sweet reunions and for love's most lavish expressions. It is a season also when homes should be opened to the homeless. Christmas is preeminently the children's festival. It is a day that ought to be filled brimful of joy for every child. But let the joy be sanctified by thoughts of the Holy Child Jesus.

"Thank God for Christmas! Thank Him again for the people who have Christmas in their hearts the whole year round!"

I ask that what I have just read may be printed in the regular RECORD type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously made, until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 23, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Robert L. Newton, Arvada.
Flossy H. Ritter, Austin.
Joseph A. Measures, Grand Junction.
Ethel M. DeBerry, Keenesburg.
James R. Lysaght, San Acacio.

MICHIGAN.

Marie L. Mottes, Alpha.
Elmer E. Fales, Belding.
Dana Stowell, Comstock Park.
Oscar W. Fowler, Greenville.
Christine Anderson, Holton.
Neil W. Roe, Lake Odessa.
Oscar W. Greenlund, Stambaugh.
Frank R. Church, Stanton.

MONTANA.

Laura P. Johnson, Darby.
Franklin R. Whaley, Fairview.
Malcolm K. Kedzie, Libby.

NEVADA.

Daniel E. Morton, Carson City.
Anna L. Fleming, Jarbidge.
Owen H. Bott, Mason.
George L. Whorton, Yerington.

TEXAS.

Paul B. Mueller, Beeville.
John K. Ford, Bogata.
James S. Mewhinney, Buckholts.
Lou Gammill, Calvert.
Rebecca White, Carbon.
William F. Moore, Kemp.
John L. Dillon, Leonard.
Arthur A. McNeil, Moody.
William Tays, New Braunfels.
Joseph Wren, Normangee.
Gustave Natho, Skidmore.
Ernest G. Langhammer, Somerville.
Evan S. Howell, Stephenville.
James M. Campbell, Strawn.
Hiram H. McGuffey, Three Rivers.
Miles B. Earnheart, Trenton.

UTAH.

Walter O. Lundgreen, Monroe.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, December 23, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Lord, for earth's gladdest day! Thou wilt soon speak Thy deepest note of love! We bless Thee that in the new earth that He shall bring there shall be no hate, and in His Heaven there shall be no cloud. We thank Thee that Thou dost satisfy the hunger-cry of earth. Let the angels' song break forth and flood the unborn years with peace. Give unto all of us the spirit that fulfills the obligations of His mission. Spirit of God, descend upon our whole land and awaken the wearied hearts of men with Christmas cheer and good will. Bind our citizenship together in confidence and create in it strong desires for the things that ennoble our Republic. The Lord bless our President and fill all homes with the sweetest joy. Remember the children, and may they bring to their parents increasing comfort while the days go by. And O the loved ones not at home and far away and the families separated—gather them all beneath the shadow of Thy wing and keep us all strong and pure in the faith of our Heavenly Father. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSIONS—REFERENCE OF BILLS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 12157 and the bill H. R. 12545, omnibus pension bills, be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the two bills referred to, omnibus pension bills that are on the calendar, be rereferred to the Committee on Pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the proposed tariff on potash.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that before the recent tariff act became a law and while the bill was still before Congress an attempt was made to impose a small duty on potash imported for fertilizer purposes, to be limited to a period of three years, after which potash was to be placed on the free list.

It is a recognized fact that this country is dependent upon foreign potash for its supply for fertilizer uses, and that the producers in Germany and France practically have a monopoly of this business. This situation was brought home to American farmers with bitterness and to their great cost during the World War, and led to various experiments looking to the establishment of the potash industry in this country with a view to making us independent of the foreign monopoly.

Potash production got under way in America as a result of World War necessities and had already made considerable progress when this tariff duty on potash was proposed. It was not certain that the industry could be developed to that point where it would actually supply all the potash needed in the United States. Some people had doubts that it ever could be, while others were more confident. However, some very eminent authorities believed the experiment was worth trying anyway, and that, even if it did not turn out that we would be able finally to produce all the potash required for our domestic needs, we might succeed in producing enough to hold the foreign monopoly somewhat in check maybe and tend to stabilize the price at a reasonable figure.

At any rate, the tariff duty was to be kept on potash for only three years. If in that time the experiment of domestic production succeeded, well and good; the industry might take care of itself without the tariff after that, and the fact that potash was then to go onto the free list would prevent the establishment of a potash monopoly right here at home in the place of the foreign monopoly it was hoped to escape from by this experiment.

On the other hand, if the experiment did not work the tariff duty would have been imposed for only three years, and would cost the individual farmer very little, comparatively speaking—the average Vermont farmer about 75 cents a year—and agriculture and allied trades would then have definite proof that they had little or nothing to expect from a domestic product—in the immediate future, anyway—and would make plans accordingly. Meanwhile potash would be on the free list.

It was simply the same old common-sense proposition to employ the policy of a protective tariff for the purpose of establishing an American industry that would render the American farmer independent of a foreign monopoly—in one of his necessities, anyway.

Some of us voted for this proposition, but it failed to carry, and potash went onto the free list, leaving the country wholly at the mercy of the foreign potash monopoly.

In view of this fact no doubt the following letter from the Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, will be of interest to many people, especially to our farmer neighbors. The news contained in it is only the first whiff from the potash beds of Germany and France since the free traders won out on this item. Here is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 13, 1922.

Hon. FRANK L. GREENE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am pleased to acknowledge your communication of December 11, wherein you ask for verification of information to the effect that potash prices in Germany have increased 250 per cent over the prices of October 1.

In reply you are informed that a cable report received in the Department November 11, 1922, from Commercial Attaché C. E. Herring, at Berlin, stated among other things that "inland potash prices effective November 3 increased approximately 250 per cent over those of October 1."

For your further information I might state that a cable report received a few days ago from Mr. Herring covering the month of November, 1922, advises that German potash prices effective December 1 were approximately 145 per cent higher than those of November 1.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. Hicks in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this item carries the sum of \$531,000 for the purpose of dealing with the gypsy and brown-tail moths. It has been but a few years since this disease was imported from foreign countries to the Eastern States.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman please state on which page the item is?

Mr. RAKER. On pages 50 and 51, beginning with line 21 on page 50 and ending with line 16 on page 51.

When the legislation was before the Committee on Agriculture a great effort was made to defeat it on the ground that there was about \$100,000 worth of equipment all over the East held by foreign importers. In other words, the question of quarantine intervened.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOWELL. Was this paragraph pending last evening?

Mr. RAKER. That is a very legitimate inquiry. The RECORD shows, Mr. Chairman, that this paragraph was read last night, and I rose to be recognized. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] moved that the Committee rise, and the Committee rose, and we are now back to the consideration of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from California is entitled to be heard on the item.

Mr. RAKER. Each year there has been expended about this amount by the Federal Government. The State of Massachusetts and the State of New York, I think, have expended a large amount of money for the same purpose.

The only purpose that I have in calling the attention of the committee to this is that it shows what will be done and what can be done by our leniency in permitting foreign infected plants and bulbs to enter the United States, and the large amount of money required to eradicate them after they have once entered. I call particularly to the attention of our good friends from the East the fact that like or similar conditions that destroy the products of the West should be given consideration along with and in connection with the appropriation for the eradication of various diseases and pests in the East, and I therefore trust that when we reach certain items on the next page our friends from the East who are procuring such large appropriations will see that like consideration is extended to the protection of the crops in the various Western States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PREVENTION OF SPREAD OF EUROPEAN CORN BORER.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the spread of the European corn borer and to provide means for the control and prevention of spread of this insect throughout the United States, in cooperation with the States concerned, including employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$200,000: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture \$75,000 of this amount shall be available for expenditure only when an equal amount shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed over for the present. My colleague [Mr. HAUGEN] has an amendment which he desires to offer to this paragraph, and I make the request because he is not present at the moment. He will be here in a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over for the moment without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there are about 20 Members of Congress assembled here to pass this Agricultural appropriation bill. We have already agreed that we will not take the final vote on it until after the holidays. If we are going to pass over a paragraph from time to time to accommodate some particular absent Member, there is no use in holding these men here and keeping them from their Christmas shopping. I object. I think if we are going to pass this bill we ought to pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. DOWELL. I make this request, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that my colleague [Mr. HAUGEN] has prepared and desires to offer an amendment to increase the appropriation, I think, some \$200,000. I move to strike out, in line 24, page 51, the figures "\$200,000" and insert "\$400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DOWELL. I ask this in behalf of my colleague [Mr. HAUGEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWELL: Page 51, line 24, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000."

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman know whether the Department of Agriculture wants this? I think we ought to give them every dollar they need to fight the corn borer, but if they do not need it, I think it is mere folderol and not to appropriate more money than they ask for.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman is correct; but my understanding is that this corn borer is spreading very rapidly and that more money is needed than has been appropriated in order to check the spread of the borer. I should like to ask if the

chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ANDERSON] will report the information he has relative to this appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be very glad to make a complete statement of the situation in my own time, if the gentleman desires me to do so. I do not care to go into it piecemeal.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Doctor Howard, on page 315 of the hearings before the committee, says:

We ask for no increase there. The European corn borer spread into Rhode Island and Maine this past year and made a slight spread along the southern border of Lake Erie, but the work we are carrying on is the same as last year, and I do not know if you want any further work on it or not.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand, this pest has spread into the State of Michigan and other States, and I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee explain the situation, if he will.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be very glad to do so. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The statement was made a moment ago that there were only 20 Members present. I want to correct that statement. There are 30 Members present. I have counted them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if there were any likelihood, if, indeed, there were any possibility, of eradicating the corn borer from the United States I would unhesitatingly be in favor of any appropriation, however large, to accomplish that purpose. The situation at present is this: The corn borer came to this country prior to the passage of the plant quarantine act, in a shipment of broom corn from some foreign country, if my recollection is correct. The first infestation was found in the neighborhood of Boston, Mass. It has never been possible to control that infestation, which has now spread to the neighboring States of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island.

In addition to this infestation there is a smaller one in eastern New York and another larger one in western New York, northern Ohio, and southeastern Michigan, around Lake Erie. The infestation in the vicinity of Boston and in Boston is very intense. There the insect has two broods a year, whereas in the other places it has only one. I may say that in one stage of its life history this corn borer is a moth, and if during the season when it is in that stage there are high winds it spreads to very great distances.

The infestations in and around Lake Erie are very slight indeed, and practically no commercial damage is done there, the infestation amounting to about 1 per cent; that is, a worm in 1 stalk in 100. In addition to infesting corn this worm infests all kinds of hollow-stemmed plants and weeds. In the Boston district the weeds are full of them. It affects certain kinds of hollow-stemmed flowering plants. The consequence is that it is utterly impossible to eradicate it without destroying altogether all vegetation in the district in which it is located, either by gas flames or by chemicals of some sort. The impossibility of eradicating the worm and the insect in a district like Boston, where it infests the garden plots all through the city and the weedy spaces in the vacant lots and in the marshes, is perfectly obvious, and I do not believe there is a single entomologist in the United States of any repute whatever who believes it is possible to eradicate the corn borer from this country; because in addition to burning all vegetation in the district in which it is located it would be necessary to have the complete cooperation of everybody who grows anything in that district.

It has been very difficult to control the spread of the insect in and around Lake Erie because of the light infestation and the small commercial damage, which does not give the farmers the fear that would impel them to adopt the methods and give the cooperation necessary to eradicate the insect there.

There are two or three things which can be done to control the spread of this insect in this country. The first is by quarantine, preventing its spread by commercial shipments of corn or other plants which may be infested.

The second method is by clean-up measures in the cornfields and in the garden patches in the fall of the year, both of the stalks of corn and of the weeds in the fence corners, and so forth; that will destroy a certain proportion of the worms and thus retard the new growths.

The third method is by the introduction of parasites. The Bureau of Entomology is now engaged in a very thorough sur-

vey in the sections of Europe where this corn borer is found, studying the parasites with a view of reproducing in this country the complete environment of the corn borer abroad. It infests the corn-growing sections all along the southern Mediterranean, but there the parasites are so numerous that the commercial damage is practically negligible. More than a million of one species of parasites were liberated in this country last year, and it is expected that by the use of parasites in the infested sections of the country it will be possible to control the damage of the insect and in part to control its spread.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Just how does the insect operate, and to what extent does it damage the crops, and has the insect yet gotten into the large corn-growing sections of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. As I say, in one stage of the life history of this insect or bug it is a sort of grub that infests the corn stalk and sometimes comes up through the end of the ear of corn. It is often confused with the ordinary corn worm that we find in the corn-growing sections of the country. It performs very much like it when it reaches the ear of corn. The commercial damage depends altogether upon the extent of the infestation. If the infestation is very heavy, it is sufficient practically to destroy the utility of the corn altogether, particularly sweet corn.

So far the borer has not reached any of the great corn-growing sections of the country. It has been found two townships west of Detroit, Mich. That is as far west as it has gone. It will probably not infest the corn-growing section of southern Ohio and Indiana, because of the divide there between the rivers running north into the Lakes and the rivers running south into the Ohio. If it should ever get over that divide, for example, if some corn stalks that were infested should be carried over the divide and float down the river toward the Ohio, there might be the possibility of infesting the corn-growing sections there.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, as I understand the gentleman who has given a great deal of study to this question, it is admitted by practically all the students of the habits of this insect and its infestation that it is impossible to entirely eradicate it, and the best that can be done is a reasonable control of it, and that can be done with the appropriation that is made in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The appropriation as it stands is the amount recommended by the Budget officer and the amount recommended by the Department of Agriculture to the Budget. It covers the quarantine in part; it covers the control of the spread of the disease, the putting on of the campaign for the cleaning up of the fields, the scouting work that is being done to prevent the spread into new territory; and I think it is as large as can be economically used for the purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. According to the statement of the gentleman, what is being done by the department is to retard the spread. There is no statement the gentleman has made to indicate that it is being eradicated. The gentleman says it is spreading constantly and that what is being done now by the department is merely to retard this spread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, if the gentleman will yield, the spread of this insect eventually, according to the statement of the gentleman, unless something is done more than is now being done by the department, will extend into Indiana, Ohio, and through the Corn Belt of the Middle West. Is it not possible, if a sufficient appropriation is made, that this can not only be retarded but a great deal done toward blotting it out and eventually entirely destroying it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it possible at all. I think it is probably inevitable that the corn borer will eventually reach the great corn-growing section of the country.

Mr. DOWELL. Does that mean destruction?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. It is altogether probable that we can introduce the parasitic environment of the insect, and the damage will be very slight if that can be done.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the gentleman comes to this proposition that after its spread into the Corn Belt we will proceed to blot it out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. DOWELL. As it stands now we will let it spread, making slight efforts to retard it, but eventually it will get where we will have to take hold of it in earnest.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we will do everything that is possible to retard its spread, but my judgment is that any program based on eradication of the corn borer in the United States can not succeed and will simply be a waste of money. The \$200,000 that the gentleman proposes would not be a drop in the bucket on a program of eradicating the pest. Ten million dollars would not be enough; you would have to burn up all the vegetation of every sort in the section in which the pest is working. You would have to compensate the owners, and you would practically have to clean up the whole area of vegetation for years.

Mr. DOWELL. But that is much cheaper than to have this pest spread into the Corn Belt and destroy corn growing in the future.

Mr. ANDERSON. You can not possibly destroy the pest in this country; you can not completely eradicate it.

Mr. MONDELL. The position of the gentleman from Minnesota is that there is no possibility of eradicating it by any effective means.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is the judgment of the entomologists of this country. It is certainly mine.

Mr. MONDELL. And we must simply introduce the parasites, the counterpests and the counterirritants that keep the insect under control in the land of its nativity.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and prevent its spread.

Mr. DOWELL. According to the gentleman, it will spread into every part of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is possible.

Mr. DOWELL. And according to the gentleman, it will spread into every section of the country; and is it not better and easier now to plan to blot it out, if we can possibly do it?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be a sheer waste to spend a little more money on it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] may present his amendment, I desire to withdraw my amendment, which was offered in view of the fact that the gentleman from Iowa was not then in the Chamber.

Mr. ANDERSON. I suppose I still have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. The chairman has explained what the Federal Government is doing under this appropriation and has stated that the amount of the appropriation is sufficient. Is it not a fact that in addition to what the Federal Government is doing there is a large cooperative work being done by the States?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has not been as large as it ought to have been, but it will be larger the next year by considerable.

Mr. DOWELL. Let me say—

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I have the floor, and I would like to keep it.

Mr. DOWELL. I simply wanted to say that if it is not permitted to spread into the States, the States will not be required to make an appropriation.

Mr. MCKENZIE. As I understand this appropriation, it is simply to pay experts to travel over the country to investigate, to ascertain, whether or not certain sections are infested with this pest.

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. MCKENZIE. In other words, it does not carry with it any police regulation that would enable the expenditure of money in eradicating this pest, and if that is true, then \$200,000 would not amount to anything.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have, of course, no Federal police regulations which would enable us to control the pest in any event. Police regulations are always enforced by the State boards, the bureaus of entomology, because they have police powers which we have not. I do not want to leave the impression, however, that all that is being done is to scout around and see where this bug is. A very strict quarantine is being maintained, and in addition to that, in cooperation with the States, a campaign is being conducted to clean up the pest, so far as that is possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask some other questions of the gentleman from Minnesota. At the present time there are but very few States that will contribute to the blotting out of this pest. There is not a State in the Union that is not just as much interested in the matter as is the State where the pest has already taken hold. Under this condition the States will contribute only a very small amount, and is it not better for the

States all to contribute and stop this pest where it is than to leave it to the cooperation of two or three States that are now infected? All of the other States have very much interest in the matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman's question is like the question of the lawyer who asked the witness whether he had stopped beating his wife. Whatever you answer it is wrong. The assumption is wrong to begin with that it is probably possible to stop this pest where it is.

Mr. DOWELL. I think if we are going to assume that nothing can be done to stop this pest, then we must assume that it is already beyond control, and that it is too late to do anything.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman subscribe to the chairman's statement as to how this pest is spread; by high winds in the moth stage, as one of the commonest ways of spreading?

Mr. DOWELL. I know nothing of this. If it is spread in that way, there is not any question in the world but that it will spread all over the United States.

Mr. BEGG. Then any appropriation we might make will not stop it, except absolute eradication.

Mr. DOWELL. But it is much easier to stop it if it is in only two or three places than if it is in many.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in stopping this pest, and like the gentleman I would vote for any appropriation that would accomplish the result, but is not the gentleman afraid that some of this money might blow on the wind just like the borer is being blown?

Mr. DOWELL. I am assuming that the department will earnestly make an endeavor to do everything possible to stop the spread of this pest.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I rose also to make a more serious inquiry, and that is this: For what purpose is it proposed that this additional \$200,000 shall be used? It is plain that it can not be used for eradication.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman may have a complete answer to his question, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment that I have offered, in order that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] may offer an amendment which he desires to offer to this section and which I favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is there any difference between the amendment the gentleman has offered and the amendment that his colleague desires to offer? If there is not, why does not the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] take some time now?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not know what the gentleman's amendment is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, that could not authorize an amendment that is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 51, line 24, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the object of the amendment is to increase the appropriation from \$200,000 to \$500,000. I was pleased to hear the chairman of the committee state that we should do everything in our power to restrict and eradicate this pest. I am heartily in accord with that. I take it that the only way to eradicate this pest is by clipping its wings, and the only way that you can clip its wings is to provide for adequate funds to stop the spread of the pest.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman believe that it is possible to eradicate this pest?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not an expert on that, but whether it can be done or not it is our duty to do our best to stop it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. What I had in mind was to get whatever information the gentleman has obtained from his extended study of this question as to the possibility of eradication. It has been asserted by some that it is impossible to eradicate it.

Mr. HAUGEN. The information that I can give is that evidently adequate appropriations have not been made. It is now time that Congress does its duty and makes adequate appropriations to stop the spread of the pest. According to the testimony, the corn borer is not now in the Corn Belt west of the Mississippi. What I am trying to do is to stop it crossing the

Mississippi River. It is bad enough that it should destroy the crops of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and other Eastern and New England States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is not trying to draw the line at the Mississippi, I hope; some of us are east of the Mississippi.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is in the State of Wisconsin now; it has gone beyond Indiana. It is in Illinois. It is in the gentleman's State.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I want our State to be included in the stopping of this.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then, in that case, the gentleman should vote for the increase. It may be, as has been stated, that \$500,000 is not adequate. I am perfectly willing to make it more; yes, \$10,000,000 if the gentleman from Minnesota thinks it is necessary. I am interested in eradicating this pest.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman says that we are to blame for not appropriating enough money. Have we ever cut down the appropriation for the corn borer?

Mr. HAUGEN. We have been taking the advice of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BEGG. And the Department of Agriculture does nothing; is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; the representatives of the department are asking for an additional appropriation. I believe it should be granted.

Mr. BEGG. In the hearings which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] just read a few minutes ago it is stated that the department does not want any more.

Mr. HAUGEN. I can read from the hearings. Would that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. BEGG. I am not making the statement; it was the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HAUGEN. Here is the statement.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think we would all join the gentleman from Iowa in doing everything we can to eradicate this pest or keep it within certain bounds.

Mr. HAUGEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the honored chairman of that committee for many years, has it not been the policy of the Federal Government to make appropriations to employ experts and men well versed in all these lines to go out into the country and investigate and report on the best plan to eradicate or destroy any and all of these various pests that affect agriculture? Is not that true?

Mr. HAUGEN. The department submitted its estimate some years ago. We told the representatives at that time that the \$250,000 asked was inadequate. We suggested that it make further investigation, and when it had ascertained the facts to tell us what would be required and we would make the appropriation, whether half a million or five million dollars. We felt in regard to it exactly as we felt in regard to the eradication of tuberculosis. The only way to eradicate this pest is to do what we did with the citrus canker. The department asked some \$25,000 or \$50,000. The committee held that the proper way to do it was not to appropriate \$25,000 or \$50,000 but to give whatever amount was required to stamp it out. The committee increased the appropriation over the estimates, and as a result of having adequate funds the citrus canker was stamped out. Had the same policy been pursued in the eradication or preventing the spread of these pests, we would have at least confined it to a small area and possibly have entirely eradicated it by this time. Now it has spread on. I have been told that it is in the State of Wisconsin, and according to the printed testimony it is in Michigan doing damage and in most of the States east of the Mississippi River.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I ask that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, following my first question on the policy of the Government, I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is possible for the Government with the \$200,000 provided in this bill to employ a sufficient number of experts to determine on the best manner of eradicating this pest and then—

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly not. My friend, there is no question about it. We have given only \$200,000, and as a result, with the appropriations made, the corn borer has been steadily

moving on from the New England States to Wisconsin. What we want to do is to eradicate it, if possible to do so, rather than to only study and investigate it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then the gentleman will admit that \$200,000 more would simply mean nothing at all?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not admit that. It is possible that \$500,000 is not sufficient. It may be necessary to increase that amount. The corn crop for 1917 was more than 3,000,000,000 bushels, valued at more than \$3,900,000,000, three times the value of the wheat crop of this country, twice the value of the cotton crop of this country. Are we going to stand by and allow that crop amounting to 3,000,000,000 bushels to be destroyed by this pest?

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. If I may have more time. First, I want to put in the RECORD exactly what representatives of the department stated, so there will be no mistake about that. I think the testimony will satisfy the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to read one paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. I prefer to read it.

According to the testimony of Doctor Howard and Mr. Walton of the department, printed in the hearings, as before stated, that insect is spreading. I read from page 307 of the hearings:

There has been a general spread to the northeastward, in the general direction of the prevailing wind. * * * The spread there this year equals the entire area of infestation that had occurred during previous years.

Doctor Howard asked:

There is extraordinary damage in New England this year, is there not?

Mr. WALTON. In New England we have a great increase of injury to garden crops. * * * There was a great deal of early sweet corn raised in the eastern New England area, and as the injury by the insect increased, farmers began to discontinue growing it, because it was unmarketable, and the consequence has been that the corn borer spread to these other crops—celery, beets, beans, and rhubarb—and at the present time the infestation in these crops is very heavy. There has been a good deal of commercial injury this fall. * * * The injury to corn was so heavy that the sweet-corn farmers have practically ceased producing it, except for local consumption. * * * The insect spread * * * to the center of New Hampshire, and they have flown along the Maine coast for a long distance. There is the heaviest infestation in Massachusetts and New England this year that ever has existed. * * * We are merely attempting to maintain quarantine, scouting, and limiting the area of the infestation (p. 308).

CANADA.

Mr. WALTON. A very intense infestation of the corn borer was discovered near St. Thomas, in southern Ontario, in 1920. * * * There was very severe injury to corn. Some of the flint-corn fields were an entire loss. Since then either the insect has spread, or the scouting work has been much more effective, and it has been found that practically the entire southern half of the Province of Ontario is infested with the insect (p. 309).

Mr. ANDERSON. Have we got a prospect of getting this bug all over the United States in due time (p. 309)?

Mr. WALTON. It looks that way, although perhaps the spread will be slow.

(Page 307.)

Mr. WALTON (referring to Michigan). There is some apparent injury; for instance, one shipment of sweet corn was taken to a canning factory which had 7 per cent of the ears infested, but that was from a single farm.

Doctor HOWARD. We are making a more intense study of European parasites than ever before.

Mr. WALTON. The New York people are doing what they can in the way of education, and we are receiving active cooperation from the State people, the New York and Massachusetts people.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any clean-up work?

Mr. WALTON. The commissioner of Massachusetts is endeavoring now to secure funds for that purpose. He thinks he can get \$100,000, but he wants the Federal Government to help him. * * * In Massachusetts the funds are insufficient for that purpose.

Mr. WALTON. The States furnished this year, for the cooperative work, a total of \$49,700. This is distributed as follows: Michigan, \$4,000; Ohio, \$11,000; New York, \$15,000; Massachusetts, \$15,000; New Hampshire, \$2,000; Maine, \$2,000; and Vermont, \$700.

Doctor HOWARD is thoroughly scared now.

Mr. WALTON. Without the conduct of a thorough scouting work in the Mississippi Valley States, which should be done to determine whether the insect is present or not, that we can not do with the present funds. We had to neglect that during the present fiscal year.

That is what representatives of the department had to say about its importance. Is it not worth considering?

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I prefer that the gentleman discuss it in his own time. Is not the testimony of those in charge of the work of importance and worth considering?

I think there is sufficient evidence here to show that it is spreading. The gentleman from Wisconsin states that it is in Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Indiana stated that it is in Indiana. Virginia, Maryland, and other Eastern States are full of it. The question is whether we are going to stop its spread or allow it to spread all over this country? It is

now up to the Mississippi River. Are we going to allow it to cross? I for one am against allowing it to cross the Mississippi River. I am in favor of driving it back.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does the gentleman agree with the chairman of the committee that the eradication of this pest is impossible?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. If nothing can be accomplished in that direction, then the \$200,000 proposed would be a waste, too. I think a more determined effort should be made than is suggested by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] opens up a wide series of questions in regard to the work carried on under the Department of Agriculture. From time to time new pests injurious to agriculture appear, insect pests and plant diseases. From time to time pests and diseases that have been known from time immemorial increase their ravages and become very destructive. The question always arises as to the practical way of handling and disposing of such enemies of agriculture. It is quite natural that those who live in the regions where the pests or diseases occur, those whose crops are affected, should become very earnest about the matter and should insist that nothing be left undone, that there should be no limit to the expenditure to stamp out, to eradicate, the pests or diseases, as the case may be.

Now, what is the history and experience of that sort of endeavor?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman had quite a bit of time. If the gentleman will permit me to lay down my proposition and make my statement, he can ask questions later. I am asking this question now in all good faith of the experts and gentlemen before me: Have we ever succeeded, with all our efforts, in eradicating any disease or any insect enemy of plant life that had become widely distributed in the country? Have we ever been able to do that?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MONDELL. I want an answer to my question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think there is a single case where there has been a complete eradication. There have been cases where it has been practically complete, but not entirely so.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and where that occurs the gentleman from Minnesota will admit, or his experience will lead him to state at least, that the success we have had has not been so much in the direction of eradication by physical process—I doubt if we have ever done that—as eradication through the introduction of enemies of the disease, or of the insect, or the adoption of methods whereby we minimize the injury and destruction. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is quite true. The only exception I know of is the citrus canker, which we eradicated from commercial orchards. There is still some of it in privately owned orchards that are not run on what is known as a commercial basis.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Has not the cattle tick been eliminated from some areas?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but there are still some cases in other areas.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not speaking of animals. You get into a different field when you speak of animals. There is a possibility, I think, of entirely eradicating certain diseases of animals; but we have quite a different situation to deal with when we get into the question of diseases and enemies of plant life.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true, however, that the Government has only just recently taken action with reference to the corn borer? Is not this just a recent pest that has taken hold?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] very wisely pointed out, we have employed experts, the best experts obtainable, for the consideration of these matters; and I think their judgment is rather better than ours as to the methods to be pursued and as to the work to be done and as to the expenditure necessary to do all that, in their opinion, can be done in a really effective way.

Now, you can spend all the money in the Treasury endeavoring to eradicate pests. My memory runs back much further than that of some of you young gentlemen gathered here. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I remember when we were asked to eradicate the Colorado beetle. I remember when there was a very great deal of excitement on this floor over the invasion of the Russian thistle, and I recall the tremendous effort put forth to eradicate that weed or keep it limited within certain sections. It crossed the continent. It did its work. We got acquainted with it, and we finally began to utilize it as a stock food, and nobody is particularly worried or disturbed over the Russian thistle now. It grows everywhere. It is a common weed. No more harmful than the weeds it crowded out.

Mr. DOWELL. Is the gentleman trying to get an introduction to the corn borer that is destroying the corn? Is that the reason why he does not want it stamped out now?

Mr. MONDELL. I admit that I know little of the corn borer. I have never met one of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have not had the benefit of this argument.

Mr. MONDELL. I am sorry the gentleman has not, because there has been 25 minutes of very illuminating discussion.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is the department getting what it has asked for?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; all it asked.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Would the \$200,000 give them ample resources to employ all of the facilities they have at hand for this work?

Mr. MONDELL. They tell us so.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. If then that be true, what are they going to do with the other \$300,000, with no more facilities to work on?

Mr. MONDELL. We could spend \$300,000, we could spend \$3,000,000, we could spend \$30,000,000 in attempting to physically destroy this pest. We could authorize any amount of expenditure for the destruction and burning of crops, for the burning of the vegetation in the territory infested by the creature, and the experts on the subject tell us that after that was all done it would be impossible to eradicate them.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. If our appropriation utilizes the maximum facilities at our command, it seems to me we will have done all that can practically be accomplished.

Mr. DOWELL. If it costs the Government \$200,000 annually with this pest now in only two or three States, and with the testimony here clearly showing that it is bound to spread all over the United States, what is it going to cost us after it has spread all over the United States?

Mr. MONDELL. It may not cost a dollar, and 10 years from now we may have forgotten all about it. Not being a prophet I do not desire to prophesy, but I should not be at all surprised if it was discovered that this insect will be comparatively harmless when it reaches the corn-growing region of the Mississippi Valley. It is an insect pest that has proved very destructive under certain conditions to sweet corn in the regions where field corn does not grow at its best. We have no information that it would be in any wise more injurious to field corn in the corn country than a score of other pests now in that section. It might take the place of some others that now trouble us.

I realize that the people in the Corn Belt, hearing of this pest in the sweet-corn region of the country, in the land not ideally adapted to the growing of corn, may urge appropriations running into the millions to keep this pest away from them. They may say, "We do not care how much you spend; we insist that you shall spend all the money that anybody may suggest in attempting to do something that the experts say you can not do." The probability is that we can only control this pest as we control other like pests, first by the introduction of its enemies. This creature came to America free from some of the conditions and some of the natural enemies that nature had brought into being to control it in its natural habitat. We can adopt methods minimizing the destruction, we can do many things in a reasonable, intelligent, scientific way; but this idea that you can go out into a country as vast as ours, and actually wipe out a pest that has infested not only the cornfields but all

the vegetation of vast areas, is, if I may say so without being offensive—and I certainly do not want to be offensive—a ridiculous one. It can not be done.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman is going to stop this eventually by bringing in its enemies—

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say I was going to stop it.

Mr. DOWELL. That is the policy suggested. And if so, why is it not cheaper to bring in the enemies now than to wait until the pest has spread further?

Mr. MONDELL. We are learning about its enemies now with this appropriation, and we have given all they ask and all they want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wyoming be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wyoming be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object, Mr. Chairman. I ask that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes—5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER], and 3 minutes to myself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should just like to say that in Maryland we have 645,000 acres devoted to the growing of corn, with increasing production; but I want to say that I think the Agricultural Department has asked for and the committee has made the right appropriation, and I stand by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that anyone interested in agriculture will want to be in the attitude of not being in favor of doing everything within human possibility to eradicate the corn borer, but I think we now have a real Department of Agriculture. There are some other items in this bill that my section of the country is interested in. Take, for instance, the Hessian fly, that works on wheat. I would like to be in a position here of having offered an amendment to increase by \$300,000 or \$400,000 the item carried for the eradication of the Hessian fly; but time has demonstrated that the only way to fight the fly is with its enemies, in the same way that the Department of Agriculture has decided that the only way to fight the corn borer is with its enemies. I remember my first experience on the Agricultural Committee, when they presented us with photographs of scientists out in the wheat patches with scissors cutting weeds to find the corn borer. They found him, and they have found the parasites that will fight him, and the department say they can use \$200,000 successfully for that purpose. Now, what would they do with the other \$300,000?

Mr. BLANTON. Waste it.

Mr. TINCER. It would read good, it would sound good to the people in the Corn Belt. Suppose I should offer to increase the \$170,000 provided for in this bill to fight the worst enemy that the breadwinners of this country have in the world, the Hessian fly. What would they do with the money if I should increase the appropriation?

Time has demonstrated that the Government can only fight the fly with the parasites which are its enemies, and they can buy more than there are for sale and they can provide more than there is any way of providing with that appropriation. I do not know who it is on the floor of this House that is in a position to say, "I am so well informed that I want a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, and I want you to tell them to take more money than they are asking for to fight these pests." I want to compliment Mr. Wallace on the fact that he recalled the scientists and their scissors, and that he is asking for \$200,000 to buy some bugs with which to fight the worms, and that is all he wants. I believe he is so interested in this subject, and comes from a locality that is so vitally interested in it, that if there were any possibility of using an extra dollar for this purpose the Secretary of Agriculture would be here demanding it. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, some of these speeches are very interesting. It would be more helpful to the House, however, if the statements of the gentlemen were borne out by the record or otherwise true. The speech of our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is entirely similar to speeches he has made on every occasion when an attempt has been made to increase an appropri-

tion. The gentleman's statement is not startling when he says he knows nothing whatever about the corn borer. I am willing to accept that as entirely true. He says also that the Department of Agriculture asked for this amount and no more, also that it could carry on its work with this money, and therefore did not ask for a larger appropriation. All who have had experience with the departments of our Government know that requests are made by a department largely, if not altogether, on the basis of what it thinks it can get. Where we find no affirmative statement by Agricultural Department officials requesting larger appropriations it is not at all fair to conclude that no more is wished or needed.

Now, the hearings on this proposition before the Committee on Appropriations are meager, but I find on page 310 some very significant statements, not at all in line with statements made by the gentleman from Wyoming. The chairman of the subcommittee asked, "Is the amount sufficient to maintain the work on the present basis?" The witness from the department, Mr. Walton, said: "Yes; without the conduct of thorough scouting work in the Mississippi Valley, which should be done to determine whether or not the insect is present." There is indubitable testimony to the effect that the corn borer is now in the Mississippi Valley States. He continues by saying: "That we can not do with the present funds; we had to neglect that during the present fiscal year."

We know the department does not ask for all it wishes or all it needs. We are able to get no information whatever as to the hearings, if they may be called such, before the Budget Bureau, or commission, or whatever it may be called. We are kept in ignorance of the demand made of the Budget. We do not know what hearings were had or what testimony was offered in support of any proposition in this bill or in any other bill.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman been able to learn whether or not the hearings before the Budget Committee are taken and transcribed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No. It is a secret-chamber proposition, as far as I am able to learn. I have never seen any hearings. I think they are not published. Budget hearings have never been referred to on this floor. My impression is the representatives of the departments and of various branches of the Government go to the Budget Committee, make their statements, such as they are permitted to make, and no one outside of the walls of the room in which hearings, so called, are held, knows anything about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Michigan out of my time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have spoken of the principal effects as I see them. There is no doubt about the seriousness of this situation. Corn is one of our great crops and it is very seriously menaced. When the department started its work it did not know how to do it, and some of the early work was crude and ineffective. Stories of the efforts they made are really amusing, but they have worked out a better plan and are prepared to extend the work and do it efficiently, and in my judgment the appropriation ought to be increased to enable them to do so.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; although my time is short.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wonder if my colleague has not missed one of the most important features of the testimony. I want to call attention to the reply of Doctor Howard in response to a question of the chairman of the committee. It was, "They do not seem to be very scared up there?" Doctor Howard replied, "Massachusetts is thoroughly scared now." Does not my colleague think that when Massachusetts gets scared on an agricultural proposition it is time for the rest of the people to wake up? [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Massachusetts is scared because of the actual infestation of that State by this terrible plague, and the reason the large corn-growing areas of the country are not now scared is because they have not been infested to the extent necessary to arouse them. But the pest is spreading and reaching the great corn-growing areas, and the time to combat it is now, when it is in its early stage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, there were one or two statements that might give a wrong impression as to what the situation is which I want to correct. It has been indicated, perhaps unintentionally, that this infestation around Lake Erie and eastern New York came from Boston. As a matter of fact,

all the indications point to the fact that these three areas were all infested at the same time, and consequently had we undertaken the eradication program in and around Boston as soon as the infestation was learned of, it would have been wholly without effect, because the infestations were in other parts of the country.

Another statement I would like to make is that notwithstanding what has been said about the inability of the department to present its needs, the fact remains that the department asked the bureau for an appropriation of \$200,000, and that appropriation was agreed to by the Budget Bureau and the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations. They all agreed to the amount of \$200,000 as representing the amount which the department and the Bureau of the Budget finally agreed would adequately continue the work on the basis of such control of the disease as they believed to be possible.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were—13 ayes and 33 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, \$502,240.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 54, line 20, strike out the sum "\$502,240" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$652,204, provided that of the sum thus appropriated \$150,000 may be used in California."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, that is placed there deliberately and for a good purpose. The general situation is that this amount of money allowed in the appropriation bill this year, as in previous years, covers the Western States as well as the Northwest, the Mississippi Valley, and other States where there are predatory animals and others of the character named in the bill. It covers a wide stretch of territory. In the western Pacific Coast States, known as the public-land States, a large amount of the land is in public ownership, and it becomes a breeding ground for these predatory animals. Owners of land in the various States referred to must eradicate most, if not all, of these animals when the local authorities ask them to do so. If they fail to eradicate them, then a lien is attached to the land and the land is sold, so that when you live in these communities you have to participate to the extent of a large sum. Your home is involved. This is the law in California.

All we ask now is that the Government meet the conditions as we find them there. Yesterday I had inserted in the Record a letter and some resolutions from the California Wool Growers' Association. I want to read a short extract from those resolutions to show the purpose of my amendment. It is to be found on page 881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 22, 1922, and reads as follows:

Whereas the menace to the sheep industry of the State of California by the depredations of predatory animals, particularly coyotes, is of serious consequence and has amounted to losses approaching millions of dollars; and

Whereas the United States Government through its Bureau of Biological Survey, in cooperation with the State of California, has been doing effective work, as is being done in other States, but wholly inadequate to meet even the partial needs to protect this sheep industry; and

Whereas every possible agency, including local associations, county and State governments, are exerting every effort to cope with this serious menace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the woolgrowers of the State of California in convention assembled, To ask assistance from the Federal Government through Congress for an appropriation, not less than \$150,000 in amount, for the work in California, thus to make available for predatory-animal control a sum necessary for a much-needed protection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. How much does the State of California itself appropriate for this same work?

Mr. RAKER. California has appropriated for this, but at this moment I can not give the exact amount.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any evidence to show what the direct appropriation of the State is?

Mr. RAKER. I shall get it and put it in the Record later. We have been appropriating money for this and other purposes right along, not only for the coyote, but for all other animals, and, as I stated before, every man's property in the State of California is subject to having a lien placed upon it and sold for the destruction of rodents.

Mr. SNELL. I do not find any evidence that the gentleman's State, through its legislature, has appropriated any money for this specific purpose.

Mr. RAKER. It makes general appropriations.

Mr. SNELL. I asked for the specific purpose.

Mr. RAKER. No more than the item I just called attention to a short time ago for the destruction of the brown-tail moth and the gypsy moth in the gentleman's State, where we appropriate five times as much as this.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman put in the Record the definite amount that California appropriates for the items that he wants to have increased?

Mr. RAKER. I shall try to get the information for the gentleman, and at a later date will insert it. I want to call attention to the hearings on this subject. I call attention to the testimony of Doctor Nelson, found on pages 319 and 320 of the hearings. From that it will be seen that \$383,000 was collected by the department from the sale of hides that were obtained under and by virtue of this appropriation. Doctor Nelson says:

The \$502,000 is not appropriated for the predatory-animal work alone. For the predatory-animal and the rodent work combined the Government puts up about \$400,000, and the States are putting up approximately \$1,000,000 in cooperative funds. They are contributing practically two-and-a-half times as much as the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I think we should settle first the point of order. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman in his increased appropriation desires to have \$150,000 of it spent in the State of California alone, but the gentleman still has not any information as to what his own State has done in respect to this particular item.

Mr. RAKER. We find that the wool growers of California have met and have discussed this matter. They are familiar with it. Years ago they could put their sheep out, and they did not have to take the care and attention they do now, and they were not destroyed, but now, for the purpose of legitimately raising sheep, you must have a herder on the job; otherwise these animals are in your sheep, and you have lost a year's profit.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Why does the gentleman want to limit the use of the \$150,000 extra to the State of California? There are other places where they raise sheep, where they have predatory animals, as, for instance, in New Mexico. They have public land there and lots of animals, and the animals have never been properly reared to recognize the State lines, and they get across into the State of Texas at times.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, we have coyotes and wild cats that pay no attention to State lines, and they come from Texas up into California. The reason why I am asking the \$150,000 just before Christmas is that I have not had very much, and these people have not been provided for very extensively. This association is unanimously behind this. I hope the Congress will be open-minded enough to make this appropriation, to the end that the industry in the State of California may be protected and encouraged.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is less reason for increasing this appropriation than there was for increasing the appropriation with respect to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] offered his amendment a short time ago. This more than the other requires complete eradication, if you are going to get any substantial benefit from the appropriation. But eradication is impossible. Take the State of Texas, for instance. It is 900 miles across it from east to west, and nearly 1,000 miles across it from north to south. Our sheepmen have learned that whenever they protect their flocks against

coyotes they must do the eradication themselves on their own ranches.

They build wolf-proof fences, put one wire even under the ground so that the wolf can not get into the ranch. What could the Federal Government do toward eradicating even the wolves in Texas with the kind of an appropriation we annually carry? Why, it would take millions and millions of dollars to eradicate them in the United States, and unless we go far enough to eradicate them everywhere our money is wasted, for they breed almost as fast as white mice. It is a continual restocking.

I have come to the conclusion that on voting for a proposed increase of appropriations by way of amendments offered from the floor that I am going to hew to the line, first, on the Budget Committee's recommendation, and, second, the only time I am going to stray any beyond the Budget Committee's recommendation is when the committee itself comes in here and for some good reason asks for an increase.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. We have men on this Appropriations Committee who fully understand this question. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] knows about as much about the Agricultural Department's business as any man in the House. He is in charge of this bill on the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] knows about as much as any other man in the House on this subject. They have not seen fit to ask for an increase, they have not seen fit to ask for \$150,000 extra to be presented as a Christmas present to the State of the distinguished gentleman from California—

Mr. HAUGEN. According to the gentleman's statement, why do not the rest of us go to our offices or go home and leave the chairman and the assistant and the ranking Member on the Democratic side here to run the business?

Mr. BLANTON. Because we have got to stay here and help keep the good fellows from increasing the appropriations; that is why. That is why I am here. My vote counts one. [Applause.] I am going to try to do my part as one Member to keep these appropriations within bounds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California is always modest, unusually so in this case. He only wants 60 per cent spent in California on this work as is spent in all the United States put together. If the State of California would abandon its policy of paying bounties for predatory animals and adopt the same policy which the United States Government has adopted it would not be necessary for the gentleman from California to ask for this \$150,000. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserved the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the proviso makes the whole amendment subject to the point of order because the proviso is clearly legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us dispose of the point of order first, if the gentleman will permit. The Chair, looking at this amendment, and especially the proviso, thinks it is worded in such a way, as not to make it mandatory upon the department to spend the money in California. It is only an indication of where the gentleman proposing the amendment would like to have it spent, and is colorless and without force. It is not binding upon the department to spend it in that particular State; it could be spent anywhere, despite the proviso, and for that reason the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California: At the end of the amendment add the following: "Provided further, That the sum of \$150,000 here appropriated for the State of California shall not be available unless and until the State of California appropriates a like sum for the same purpose."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California as amended by the amendment just adopted.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, \$281,987: *Provided*, That of this amount \$150,000 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will say to the chairman of the committee if he does not know just where we are in the bill, it is on page 62, at the beginning of line 6.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I notice the proviso that of the total amount of appropriation \$150,000 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products. I would like to know what progress has been made in that particular line of work and how the work is carried on?

Mr. ANDERSON. The work has been carried on under two systems; one of them the so-called survey method, under which quite a large number of farms keep account, and once a year those farms are visited by the representatives of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Their accounts are gone over and the results tabulated in accordance with the general plan of the bureau. The other method is a more intense method by which representatives of the bureau visit the farmers more frequently and in such cases give them assistance in keeping these records. Of course, the latter method is by far the most accurate and scientific. Cost studies are now being made in reference to the cost of producing corn-fed beef, and the cost of producing milk on dairy farms, the cost of producing cotton, the cost of producing wheat, and a considerable number of diversified farms in reference to the cost of the farm plant as a unit and the profit arising from it. I think the work is progressing very satisfactorily, indeed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How does the amount of money here made available compare with the amount last year and in previous years. The gentleman has outlined a very ambitious program if the department visits a very large number of farms and makes anything at all of an investigation a great deal of time is required and the employment of a very large number of men is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the gentleman that these are practically all conducted in cooperation with States, and the total amount of expense in the course of the last three years—1922, \$47,929; 1923, \$85,027; and 1924, \$85,027.

In none of these three years has a total amount of \$150,000 been spent for this cost-of-production work.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman says the work has been carried on very satisfactorily. Does the gentleman mean that the work is done as carefully and skillfully as it can be done, or does he mean that results reached have been satisfactory?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think both things are true. Of course, the cost-of-production work is fairly new, and it is probable that an improvement of methods is being made all the time. But we are getting a very large volume of sound, fundamental information which is, or ought to be, valuable to the farmers of the country in connection with their problems of farm organization and farm management.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is not this along the same line as the investigation made some years ago by Doctor Spillman?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but, of course, it is on a different basis from the work that was done by Doctor Spillman.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was practically abandoned at one time, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it was practically abandoned at one time, but it has been going on under the present plan for at least three years.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Of course, the matter of crop-production costs is important, and if by any kind of investigation the department can reach satisfactory results, its work ought to be encouraged. There is, however, a wide difference of opinion as to whether results can be reached that will be at all satisfactory. I have always been in doubt as to the wisdom of this appropriation, not because it is not of interest to me, but because I am doubtful as to whether any kind of investigation will give tangible, satisfactory results as to the cost of production. The cost of production depends upon so many different things—the quality of the land, the manner in which the farmer keeps his soil fertilized, the manner in which he cultivates his crops, the time at which he puts in his crop, the time at which he harvests it, and the weather conditions,

which are changeable and variable, affecting one part of the country favorably, perhaps, and another near-by part unfavorably; there are, I say, so many things upon which success depends that it seems to me difficult, if not impossible, to reach anything like an adequate conclusion as to what the production of any particular crop has cost or will cost.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the results reached by the department in investigating the cost of production within the last few years in selected counties in the State of Iowa, for example?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I can not give the gentleman the information he wishes. I am entirely willing, if you please, to have this work go on, because if satisfactory work can be done the results will be very interesting and helpful, not only to those who are engaged in agriculture but also to consumers, because prices that prevail and prices that ought to prevail are dependent largely upon the cost of production. The farmer ought to know what it costs; the buying public also ought to know.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Can the gentleman tell whether any of the reports that are made are available to the membership?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota is entirely right in saying that the work is satisfactorily done, and that gratifying results will be reached. I repeat that I am in favor of the appropriation, although I am in a class who doubt very much if satisfactory results can ever be reached.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. The reason why the Chairman stated that the work was being conducted in a satisfactory manner and "everything was all right along the Potomac" was the fact that the farmers themselves already know exactly what it costs to produce their various farm commodities.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I had not heard of that.

Mr. BLANTON. They do down in my country. They have found it out through sad experience. They know what it costs them to produce cotton, they know what it costs them to produce corn, and they know what it costs them to produce wheat, and wool, and sheep, and cattle, and hogs.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Has it been found out down there that the cost of production is the same on any two farms in the State?

Mr. BLANTON. They have found out exactly what it costs them to produce their commodities, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan. What the farmers down in Texas are most concerned about just now is the cost of production of their manufactured wearing apparel, their shoes, boots, and farm implements. They want to know why they used to be able to buy a good 3½-inch Studebaker wagon for \$75, and now they have to pay \$200 for it, and the same with all the farm implements. They would like to know something of what the cost of production is on those articles.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not blame them.

Mr. BLANTON. They would like to know what is the cost of the production of coal, for which they are now paying \$16 and \$17 a ton.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not blame them at all, inasmuch as the selling price of their products is down and going still further down, whereas the prices of the things they have to buy are up and still going further up.

Mr. BLANTON. If we were to follow the wise admonition of the President of the United States a few years ago, when Woodrow Wilson told us that there was only one way to solve this cost-of-production business, and that was to require stamped on the article the selling price of the wholesaler, that of the middleman, and that of the retailer, then we would be performing a service to the people of the country that would be valuable indeed. Then improper profits would stop. We are wasting time and money, so far as the spending of this \$150,000 in this item is concerned, in order to tell the farmers what it costs to produce their products. They already know it, every one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question concerning the item on page 60, "For supervising the preparation, distribution, and use of picric acid" and other explosives. Are these explosives to be obtained on the application of individual farmers, or must they be obtained through some connection with an agricultural college?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the distribution is made through the State agricultural colleges as a rule to the county agents.

Mr. ROACH. The gentleman's information, then, is that the distribution is made through the agricultural colleges from the Agricultural Department here at Washington?

Mr. ANDERSON. The usual method, I think, is for applications to be concentrated with the county agents. Then they go through the State college or the State department of agriculture, and the distribution is made in substantially the same way.

Mr. ROACH. The distribution, in other words, is made from the Agricultural Department here to the various State agricultural colleges, and they in turn distribute it to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. Usually through the county agents to the persons who make the application in the first instance.

Mr. ROACH. Then the information does finally reach the individual who made the application?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; of course it does.

Mr. ROACH. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say just a word on the cost of production work. As I said a moment ago, this is pretty largely new in its present form. It is probable that it has not had the value which it would have had if the conditions had been entirely normal so that comparisons of cost of production year by year could be made more accurately. In other words, to some extent, of course, the value of these studies for purposes of comparison is destroyed by the inflation which has taken place in the credit and currency of the country, which has had a very marked effect upon prices in general. But on the whole the cost of production studies are the basis of farm management and farm organization. As we progress with this study of farm costs it should be possible to demonstrate more thoroughly the better methods of agricultural practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stock, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of live stock and live-stock products on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, \$397,000: *Provided*, That \$65,000 shall be available for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$275,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the proviso. I would like to ask the chairman is this the substantive law at the present date, that the certificate issued by authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been carried in the appropriation bills for many years. As far as I know, there is no law on the subject.

Mr. RAKER. And does it work to good advantage?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it would be almost useless without it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed Senate Joint Resolution 218, to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work

of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4131) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak., in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4133) granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of live stock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$401,400.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 18, strike out the figures "\$401,400," and insert in lieu thereof "\$426,400."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman and my Christmas colleagues, this is a little Yuletide amendment; and I recall that it is written that even during such seasons, when a hundred are gathered together in the Government's name, they have authority to grant such legislative Christmas relief as is here sought. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it was evidently intended by the subcommittee which framed this bill that the market news service, which has proven of such great interest and importance to the agricultural and stock-raising sections of the country, should be carried on effectively and without curtailing or impairing its usefulness. It was thought at the time the figures in this bill were submitted by the department to the subcommittee that they represented a sufficient sum for the proper functioning of this governmental activity. It has developed subsequently, however, that in order for the southwestern part of the country to enjoy the continuous benefits of this service an increase of \$25,000 in this appropriation is necessary.

In other words, the amount stipulated in this measure will assure to the western region the proper dissemination of market news for the full 12 months of the fiscal year, but in the southwestern section of the Nation, which is equally important in this regard and deserves similar consideration, Texas will be restricted to nine months of operation and Oklahoma will be entirely excluded. And so, I say, in that fair Christmas spirit which should preclude the possibility of discrimination among the gifts to the sister States involved, it behooves us now to play the proper rôle of Santa Claus and see that Uncle Sam displays an equal concern for the farmers and stockmen of the great Southwest.

The amount by which this amendment will increase the appropriation is not arrived at arbitrarily. I have had this matter up with the authorities in the Department of Agriculture who have administrative control of it, and the additional figure of \$25,000 has been supplied by them after a careful analysis of the situation. I think the subcommittee itself is in possession of this recent information, and for this reason I do not anticipate any serious objection to the amendment I have offered.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. In what way is this discrimination made?

Mr. LANHAM. The discrimination is not intentional. It arises from the fact that it was originally thought that the sum specified in the bill would be sufficient to carry on this work in all the various sections where it is undertaken, but that now it is found that this additional amount will be necessary if the southwestern part of the country is to have the same service during the entire year that is accorded the West.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman explain how it is that the southwestern part of the country under the law, as it stands, is not to benefit from this appropriation for the whole year while the western part of the country is?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman from Texas will pardon me, I will say that this wire service has only been extended to Texas within the last year, and the department went as far as they had the money to go and then stopped. It had been previously established at other places, and the service in those places is complete, but Texas having been the last place they went as far as they had the money to go.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. During the war Texas had such service, but after the war, on account of the great sum then necessary to carry on this work, it was discontinued. Within the last year it has been resumed, and the latest investigation of the department shows that the slight increase proposed in this amendment is essential to equalize the service in these various sections. The Southwest is very productive in fruits and vegetables and live stock and dairy and poultry products, as well as the other activities specified in this paragraph of the bill, and its farmers and stockmen, of course, are entitled to the full benefit of such information as the market-news service may afford.

For the information of the committee I desire to quote the following from the hearings on this measure, indicative of the increased demand for this service:

Mr. MARQUIS. During the past year there has been a strong demand for the market-news service. As we have observed the demand for market news is greatest when prices are low or falling. Farmers are not particularly concerned about prices as long as they are high and satisfactory. They are not searching for a market, and they are not so much interested in the choice of markets with reference to which will pay the best prices, but when prices begin to go down, then comes the call for more market information. The result is that we have had a greater call for information of this character during the past 12 months than in the past, due to the low prices. The farmers seeking markets wished to know the difference in prices at various markets, the best time to sell, and the danger of gluts; also to know the relative prices for various qualities of products. All of these things have tremendously increased the call for this sort of information, with the result that we have had frequent requests to extend this service into areas that are removed from our regular lines of communication.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is this service maintained with respect to all these various commodities—live stock, fruits, and vegetables—or only as to some of them?

Mr. MARQUIS. All of the four principal lines, live stock, meats, fruits, and vegetables, dairy and poultry products, and hay, feeds, and seeds are included, and that includes a variety of reports which go all the way from the spread in price quotations to market movements, the entire range of various kinds, grades, and qualities, and any other news that bears upon the market situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as I have just stated, they have a leased wire to Fort Worth, Dallas, and Austin, but they can not make a complete use of it unless the appropriation is increased. It seems to me that as long as we have the service there the people of Texas and Oklahoma ought to have the full benefit of it, and therefore I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, after line 18, add:

"Provided, That \$500,000, or so much of that amount as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated from any unappropriated funds in the Federal Treasury for providing seed wheat for wheat growers in the drought-stricken area in the State of Washington: *Provided further*, That all loans contemplated herein shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate and shall become due and payable on November 1, 1923, and shall bear 6 per cent interest per annum."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is new legislation, not authorized by law.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman withhold it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will withhold it for five minutes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the State of Washington has some of the best and most productive wheat lands in all the world. It also has some dry wheat lands. The farmers have been struggling for the past 15 years, some years making good crops and others very indifferent crops, but during the last five years the dry-land section has been very much reduced on account of drought. Especially has this been true during the past three years, and the year just passed has brought them down to the very minimum of production. Their credit is gone, they are mortgaged up to their ears, they are doing everything that they can do to remain on their farms and continue to grow wheat.

While this is legislation on an appropriation bill, it is nothing new for this Congress. Last year we appropriated for this same purpose for drought-stricken farmers in other States a million and a half dollars, and two years ago we appropriated \$2,000,-

000. There was loaned to the wheat growers this present year for spring seeding in the State of Idaho \$24,000; in the State of Montana, \$756,000; in the State of North Dakota, \$661,000; in the State of South Dakota, \$37,000; and in the State of Washington only \$1,730. In other words, the wheat farmers in the State of Washington have continued to grow wheat as best they could, although suffering from drought for the past five years in certain counties, without calling on the Federal Government for loans with which to buy seed wheat. What has been the result of these loans in the other States? This year they have produced the best crops that they have had for a number of years.

These farmers were enabled to remain on their farms, and have produced millions of bushels of wheat and are now able to continue their farming operations. The drought has now fallen farther west and one part of the State of Washington this year has been very hard hit. A careful investigation has been made, and it is found that there is almost 400,000 acres of ground plowed, harrowed, free from weeds, ready for seeding, but that can not be seeded unless Federal aid is procured with which to buy seed wheat.

Mr. SNELL. Has the State of Washington made any provision for an appropriation to take care of these farmers?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Our own State financiers have helped these farmers in the past, the banks have helped them, the merchants have helped them, everybody has helped them, until they have come to the point where it seems in justice to them, as compared with other farmers in other States, they are entitled to a little relief from the Federal Government.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman will remember that when we passed these other appropriations, which I myself opposed, it was stated that the credit of the States was in such condition that they could not raise the money to help these people out.

The gentleman would not want to claim that the great, big, rich State of Washington is in such financial condition that it can not help these farmers, provided it desires to do so.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. No; I would not make that claim, neither would I make the claim that the great State of New York could not improve the harbor of the great city of New York or that Mississippi, Louisiana, and other States could not prevent floods on the Mississippi. Nevertheless, we appropriate Federal funds for these purposes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman should bring up a similar argument, and then I will meet him on it. Those are general propositions. Any specific request the State of New York makes from this Government, it will put up its proportionate share for, and it seems to me that a big, rich State like the State of Washington should help these farmers first, before they come to the Federal Government.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am stating that the State of Washington, and the financial institution of that State, have helped them over five bad years, and now everything they have is mortgaged and they are not able to procure seed wheat with which to seed the 400,000 acres of land on which they have expended from \$4 to \$5 an acre in preparing the seed bed. These farmers do not want to leave their farms. They are anxious to stay. If they vacate their farms, it will be difficult to find others to occupy them. The net result will be a loss to the whole Nation.

I have seldom looked upon a sadder sight than the empty homesteads that may be found in this section. Little empty shacks with unhinged doors, broken windows, the broken wheel at the well, and the general air of desertion bear mute evidence of blasted hopes and blasted fortunes. The fortunes may have been meager, consisting of only a few hundreds of dollars—their all. But when they went upon those homesteads, their hopes were as buoyant and impelling as ever surged through human breasts. They ate the dust of the desert for years. They fought the dreary, lonely battle of the dry-land homesteader, and lost. Without money, without credit, with crushed ambitions and without hope, many of these unfortunate homesteaders have gone drifting—we know not whither.

I am endeavoring to bring a ray of hope and to give one more chance to the dry-land farmers who still cling to their farms and wage an all but hopeless battle.

Weather conditions at this time are better than for many years past and there is every probability they can grow a remunerative crop this year if seed wheat is provided.

I am asking a loan which shall be repayable on November 1. I have provided that the interest shall be 6 per cent instead of 5 per cent, which was charged the farmers in other drought-stricken regions, so that if there is any difficulty in making any of these collections the excess interest collected on some may take care of the difficult collections in other cases. I hope the

chairman of the committee, in justice to these farmers, will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the provision is legislation, and it is not germane at this point. It is a matter that has always been considered heretofore by the Committee on Agriculture and I am sure if the proposition is one where the Federal Government should appropriate, that committee will very promptly report the necessary authorization if the matter is submitted to them. It is not properly a matter that ought to be taken up in this way and put on an appropriation bill without consideration by the proper committee. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Was not the appropriation of last year incorporated in the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. My recollection is upon authorization by the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment against which the gentleman from Minnesota directs a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is not germane to the paragraph. The Chair feels that it is not germane to the paragraph; that it is an appropriation unauthorized by law and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I can not in five minutes make a full statement of the facts which we probably will want to present to another committee. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, expenses, \$1,891,660.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 19, after the word "all," insert the word "general."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, would not the total have to be changed to take into account the \$25,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. At the proper time I shall ask that all the totals be corrected to correspond with the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPLETION OF WOOL WORK.

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, \$12,000, and to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects; and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$39,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 70, line 24, after the figures "39,000," insert as a new paragraph as follows:

"For printing, binding, and distribution through the folding room of the publications entitled 'Diseases of the Horse and Diseases of Cattle,' \$200,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will reserve it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy of the most rigid sort. I have voted to reduce practically every appropriation that has come to a vote. I have offered many amendments reducing appropriations. I have not offered any amendment increasing an appropriation. Hence I think I can in good faith speak to this amendment. The Government publishes a great many different pamphlets and quite a few

books and a great many documents. I believe, of all the publications that have been provided for, the ones which are mentioned in this amendment are the most useful. I believe practically every Member of the House will agree to that fact. Now, I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not make the point of order. I want to say in this connection that I mentioned this matter to some Members, and also to the Committee on Agriculture, of which I happen to be a member—

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. JONES of Texas. In just a minute. And every member of the Agricultural Committee, I believe, agrees that these books should be provided for. We have just had the discussion of the garden-seed distribution, an item of \$360,000. It would take that much to provide garden seed. It takes more than that to provide some other documents and publications that are distributed.

This appropriation will provide 200,000 copies of each of the publications mentioned. I know that every member of the Committee on Agriculture who was present on the occasion in question thought the publications should be reprinted. I have spoken to numbers of men on both sides, and all agree that they are very valuable publications. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWREY. I just wanted to add to the statement that I think I get more letters asking for those publications and more expressions from the farmers as to the real value of them than anything else the Government sends out.

Mr. JONES of Texas. These cattle and horse books are valuable all over the United States in every man's district, and in communities where they have but one of them the neighbors call for it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Why does not the Committee on Agriculture bring in a bill authorizing the publication of those books?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They decided, in view of the shortness of the term, it would be impossible to get a resolution up before the House, and they decided it would be useless to bring it in this session for that reason, but the matter of their not being authorized was not brought up until recently. For that reason we decided it would be useless to report out a resolution and put it on the Calendar and not get it up in time to get the appropriation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Were there any hearings held on this proposition?

Mr. JONES of Texas. There was no hearing, but hearings were had when they were published before, I will state to the gentleman, and the House is familiar with the value of these books and the great demand for them among all the people wherever there are horses or cattle. If a man has only a few head there is great use for these books because they furnish valuable information as to handling and treatment.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many does it provide?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Two hundred thousand copies of each of those volumes to be distributed through the folding room in the regular manner and method of allotment. I do not think there ought to be any objection, because I do not believe any man can present a substantial objection. If you will search through the items of the appropriation bill, I do not think there is anything so valuable as these books. I do not think there is any need for a hearing, because it is a reprint of a publication that has heretofore been published and the allotment was exhausted, and there has been a demand from practically every Member here for a reprint of those publications.

Mr. SNELL. How many books will that furnish?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Four hundred thousand copies, 200,000 copies of each publication.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think it will be real economy to have the House sustain its action of yesterday in knocking out the seed proposition and utilizing that amount of money in the publication of these books?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I most certainly do. I think many fold more value will be obtained from this appropriation, which is only half as large as the one they came so near to adopting yesterday for garden seeds. The estimate of the department is in accordance with the figures I have given.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I would like to say that this is the one publication, above all others, that the farmers of my district seem to desire.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. I think it is the universal experience among the Members. I do not think there are half a dozen Members in the House that will not have use for these publications. I do not think there is any considerable number of people in the country who will not be enthusiastically in favor of this provision.

We have gone to the expense, first, of gathering all this information, and then to the expense of putting it in shape, and then we have gone to the expense of having it published once, and now all that is involved is the republication.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Why do you not include in your amendment the republication of the book called "Diseases of Sheep"? I do not know of such a publication in book form. I believe it is in pamphlet, anyway.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not think there is such a widespread demand for that. These two publications that I have mentioned are called for all over the Nation, in every State of the Nation.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that my colleague has sheep in his district, just as he has cattle and horses.

Mr. JONES of Texas. This is a matter about which I do not think there is any difference of opinion. What is the necessity of having hearings? Why not authorize a publication which everybody knows is needed?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I think these publications ought to be republished. But I do not feel, without any hearings or consideration of the matter at all, so far as it is in my power to control the situation, that I would be justified in taking the responsibility of allowing this item to go in. It is a matter that ought to go before the Committee on Agriculture or before the Committee on Printing. It would be promptly reported out, and I think it ought to be. But I make the point of order on its insertion here.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman think this is subject to a point of order? Does not the organic law authorize this?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not make the point of order, because the Committee on Agriculture has discussed this matter, and every member present at the time of the discussion expressed the hope that we would be able to get it into a legislative bill, but we came to the conclusion that we could not get a special resolution through the House because there was not sufficient time. But it was the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that these books should be republished.

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The point of order should be overruled. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the decision which he rendered the other day based upon the organic act, which act reads as follows:

The general design and duties . . . shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to secure the publication and distribute among the people, etc.

The gentleman from Minnesota meets himself coming around in a circle, because he himself cited this organic act the other day against just such a point of order, and the Chair held that the point of order was not good, as this organic act was sufficient authorization. If the Chair's decision the other day was right, clearly the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. JONES] is in order and not subject to the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield. But we are not here discussing the merits of the question. We are discussing merely the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Surely. In the discussion the other day, did not that paragraph specifically direct some man to do something? Does the gentleman say that when you specifically direct a man in an executive department to do something that is not legislation? That is what this amendment directs.

Mr. BLANTON. The amendment as to garden seeds offered yesterday by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]

specifically directed the Department of Agriculture to spend \$360,000 in collecting certain kinds of seeds and placing them in certain kinds of envelopes and placing on the envelopes a certain kind of printing, and the Chair held that it came within the provisions of the organic act and therefore was authorized.

Mr. SNELL. The Chair said he did not really think it came within the organic act, but ruled that way because he thought the House would put it in and overrule his decision as it did last year.

Mr. BLANTON. He followed the decision of the committee, and when he followed it his decision then became a precedent for him and the committee. It only forms a new precedent.

Mr. SNELL. If he follows the precedents of the House, he would be compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment does not direct the department to do anything. It simply provides an appropriation for this purpose. It contains no direction, no instruction. It is simply an appropriation for this particular purpose, and, as has been called to the attention of the Chair, the general authorizations with reference to publications in the general law are so universal in their provisions as to bring almost anything within the provisions of the organic law if you have an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Without objection, that will be done.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Chair will note that that does not contain a specific direction. It is simply an appropriation under the general provisions of the law which authorizes these different publications and the distribution of documents and printed matter and various publications of that kind. It simply authorizes an appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. SNELL. It specifically authorizes the distribution through the folding room.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is one of the usual forms of distribution. Any Government publication that is printed may be distributed through the folding room. That is one of the usual methods, but that would not be a necessary part of the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has struck the crucial point of this matter. It might be held that the appropriation of \$200,000 for a specific purpose would be in order. But the ordinary publications of the Agricultural Department are not distributed through the folding room. They are distributed by the Agricultural Department itself.

Mr. BLANTON. The Yearbooks are distributed through the folding room.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If they are so distributed there is a specific law for it; but the ordinary publications of the department are distributed by the department itself. Now, here is a specific direction that these books be distributed, not by the department but through congressional channels. I think that is plainly legislation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to change the amendment so as to leave out the words "through the folding room."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I regret to object; but if they are to be printed, they ought to be distributed by the Members of Congress, and I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the provision as to printing and binding on page 6 of this bill is a valid provision—and it seems to have been considered by everybody as unobjectionable and not subject to a point of order—I do not see how a point of order lies to the pending amendment. That provision appropriates for printing various reports, and then goes on to provide how they may be delivered and sent out, specifying that they may be distributed under the franks of Senators and Representatives, and that provision was justified on the general proposition that the organic act governing the Agricultural Department is much broader than any law that governs and controls any of the other departments of the Government. I think the Chair would

be drawing a line that is not discernible at all between the paragraph on page 6 and this amendment if he should sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair realizes that this is a rather close question, but the Chair is of the opinion that the words "through the folding room" are a direction, and therefore legislation and repugnant to the rule. The Chair recognizes the broad principles of the organic law concerning the distribution of useful information and would hold the amendment in order if it were not for that provision of direction. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment without the words "through the folding room."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 70, line 24, after the figures "\$39,000," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For printing, binding, and distribution of the publications entitled 'Diseases of the Horse' and 'Diseases of Cattle,' \$200,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] desire to speak on his amendment?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Before I vote on this proposition I wish to say that I realize the high character of these works. I have had many demands for them myself, and I should like to know something which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] perhaps can tell me, whether these works have been brought up to date. They have been out of print for many years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Since 1912.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The last printing was in 1916.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. These books treat of diseases which are common to cattle and horses, and of course medical science in these lines progresses just as it progresses in the treatment of human diseases. If these books are up to date I believe I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. They are the most valuable books published by the department.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If the books are out of date, that is another matter.

Mr. JONES of Texas. All the information covered by these books is kept down to date by the department, and the figures as to the cost of these publications were furnished by the department itself.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is there anything in these books about the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I can not answer that question specifically.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That simply illustrates what I am saying. If these books need to be revised and rewritten, we do not want to appropriate \$200,000 to have something printed that is of no value.

Mr. JONES of Texas. They are of great value. Even in the form in which they were last published these books are of a great deal more value than a lot of other things for the publication of which we have made large appropriations.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, unquestionably this book should be revised and brought down to date. Any medical book that is 10 or 12 years old is of little real value to-day.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It was last printed in 1916.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. All right; six years ago. There have been very decided advances in the treatment of certain diseases since that time.

Mr. KNUTSON. No doubt the war has led to new discoveries in veterinary treatment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. New diseases are discovered and remedies are discovered. I am heartily in favor of the publication of these books, but I think they ought to be handled in such a way as to bring them down to date.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has stated that the work has been kept up to date. Has he the assurance of the department that both these works have been kept up to date?

Mr. JONES of Texas. What I meant to say was that the work in connection with these subjects has been kept up to date.

Mr. KNUTSON. There are new methods of treating new diseases.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; the department has all that information. I will say that there is nothing in this amendment that would keep them from modernizing the books. We will not make the subject any more modern by having a hearing on it. It will be in the discretion of the department to include such information as they desire to include.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, only a short time ago this same matter was before the House and an inquiry

at the Department of Agriculture brought the information to the effect that if an additional issue of the cattle book was authorized no change would be made, that the book could be published with the entire approval of the department just as it has been published heretofore.

The department stated that a slight modification or addition would be necessary in the horse book, to cover one disease. I do not know what the medical name of it is, but in common parlance it is called the big head. I do not know that that affects horses alone.

Mr. KNUTSON. Some Congressmen, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. With that change, which can easily be made, the horse book can be published just as it is published now.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is the information I wanted.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment for two reasons: First, there has been no estimate asking for it from the Department of Agriculture; and second, I am opposed, as a general proposition, to the Government distributing so many books, pamphlets, and bulletins. As to many of them, we already have an oversupply. I am willing to grant that this particular publication called for in the amendment of my colleague [Mr. JONES] is probably one of the most useful that the Government prints, but how many will we get if this appropriation of \$200,000 is made?

Mr. JONES of Texas. There will be 400,000 copies of each book.

Mr. BLACK. That will make probably three or four hundred copies of each for each Member to distribute in his district.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Four hundred thousand copies of the horse book and 400,000 copies of the cattle book.

Mr. BLACK. The Senate, of course, will be entitled to their quota, and I should say we would receive between three and four hundred copies of each of the books.

Now, I have 271,000 people in my district. I do not know how many are farmers, but if I am to intelligently distribute these books where they are to do the most good, how am I going to pick out of that number the 300 or 400 farmers to whom they should be sent? We all know there are entirely too many Government publications now to be sent out to those who have no special desire for them. Not long ago, walking through the corridors of the House Office Building, I saw a large pile of mail sacks in front of the door of a Member, whose name I will not mention, but I counted 47 sacks of different kinds of Government documents that were going out to his district for distribution.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will.

Mr. CARTER. That was probably some lame duck who was sending out the balance of his publications.

Mr. BLACK. No; he was not a lame duck. He was a good Member of Congress for whom I have a high regard. I presume these documents and publications had accumulated in his office and he felt it his duty to get them out to his constituents.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman wants to know how he is going to distribute these books. I will tell him my experience. After we had printed the books the last time notice was given of the publication in the newspapers that the books would be printed, and I had about twice as many requests as I could comply with. I sent all of my quota and begged all that I could, and still I did not have enough copies. The gentleman will not have any difficulty in getting the mailing list for these books.

Mr. BLACK. The statement of the gentleman just reinforces the very argument I make. If any one of the farmers in my district is entitled to receive the book at Government expense, then every farmer in my district ought to have a copy who wants one.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman might apply the same logic to Members of Congress. You would not send any man unless 300,000 in his district could go.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, no. I do not agree to my friend's illustration. I hold that every farmer in my district is a citizen of my district. In some one way or another he is a taxpayer, and if these publications are to be printed at the expense of the taxpayer, and are to be distributed, then, of course, it is unsatisfactory from my point of view that there ought to be enough of them to supply every farmer who desires a free copy. Certainly the number which will be available by reason of this appropriation will not begin to go around if there is to be general distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the objection raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] against the appropriation for the printing of these books on the diseases of horses and cattle would also apply to the Agricultural Yearbook, of which we receive an allotment of about 700 copies.

The gentleman from Texas is concerned about the distribution of the book. I will say that the farmers, as a rule, have organizations in each community, and many of these organizations have libraries. These books can be placed in the libraries where they will be accessible to all.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not, in my opinion, subject to a point of order, and if I have an opportunity I will vote for it because I think it is one of the most meritorious publications that the Government issues.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this much in addition to what has been already said. I think that of all the publications issued by the Agricultural Department this is one of the most useful. I have many requests for both of these books, and I send it to those who want it and have a use for it, and they can also be circulated through their libraries. The same objection urged by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] against these publications can be urged against the publications of the Bureau of Markets. It is only those who want the information, who write for it and who make the best use of them, that they will go to. I shall favor the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take issue with my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK], with whom I usually agree on these matters.

A few days ago you put through a bill that carried an additional hundred million dollars annually, and in my opinion a very small portion of it, if applied to this proposition, would do the country a great deal more good. Since I have been in the House I have never voted to waste \$200,000 or \$300,000 on garden seeds for political advertisement. Frankly, I believe it is a mistake, and I know the farmers of my district—and I represent a farming district—think it is a mistake. I also know that a great many farmers are calling for these books on diseases of horses and cows. Every week I get letters from farmers wanting these books; they want to read them and apply their teachings in their stock raising. My friend from Texas says you can not send one to every individual. I admit that. It is not necessary to send one to every individual. But if you are going to knock it out on that ground you might as well also strike out the appropriation for farmers' bulletins. You only have an allotment of 20,000 of them a year, and you can not send one to each individual, as there are more than 200,000 people in each congressional district.

Mr. BLACK. The way I distribute those is to send a list to every registered voter in my district and allow him to select the ones he wants. I have always had enough to supply every request.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to know if he is able to do that with reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. RANKIN. Why certainly not. These books on diseases of horses and cows should not be sent out broadcast, but should be supplied to those individuals who apply for them and who are really in need of the information they contain.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we do not intend to vote on this bill to-day. I want to make the point of order that it is time to do some Christmas shopping this afternoon, and I make the point that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-eight Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll, and the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abernethy	Barbour	Brand	Burke
Ackerman	Beedy	Brennan	Burroughs
Almon	Bell	Briggs	Burtess
Ansorge	Bixler	Britten	Butler
Anthony	Blakeney	Brooks, Ill.	Byrns, Tenn.
Appleby	Bland, Ind.	Brooks, Pa.	Campbell, Kans.
Arentz	Boles	Brown, Tenn.	Cantrill
Bacharach	Bond	Bulwinkle	Carew
Baukhead	Bowers	Burdick	Chalmers

Chandler, Okla.	Griffin	McLaughlin, Pa.	Scott, Tenn.
Christopherson	Hadley	McSwain	Sears
Clark, Fla.	Hammer	MacGregor	Shaw
Classon	Hawes	Maloney	Shreve
Clouse	Henry	Mapes	Siegel
Cockran	Herrick	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Codd	Hersey	Merritt	Snyder
Cole, Ohio	Hickey	Michaelson	Speaks
Collier	Hoch	Michener	Sproul
Collins	Hogan	Mills	Stafford
Connally, Tex.	Hooker	Montague	Stegall
Connolly, Pa.	Huck	Moore, Ill.	Stedman
Cooper, Ohio	Hudspeth	Moore, Ohio	Steenerson
Copley	Humphreys, Miss.	Morgan	Stevenson
Coughlin	Husted	Morin	Stiness
Crisp	Hutchinson	Mott	Stoll
Callen	Ireland	Mudd	Strong, Pa.
Dallinger	Jacoway	Nelson, Me.	Sullivan
Davis, Minn.	James	Norton	Summers, Tex.
Deal	Jeffers, Nebr.	O'Brien	Tague
Dempsey	Johnson, Miss.	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Donlick	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Taylor, N. J.
Doughton	Jones, Pa.	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn.
Drane	Kahn	Osborne	Temple
Drewry	Kearns	Overstreet	Ten Eyck
Dunbar	Keller	Paige	Thompson
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Park, Ga.	Tillman
Dyer	Kennedy	Parker, N. Y.	Tilson
Echols	Kless	Patterson, Mo.	Tincher
Edmonds	Kindred	Patterson, N. J.	Tinkham
Elliot	King	Paul	Tucker
Ellis	Kirkpatrick	Periman	Underhill
Evans	Kitchin	Petersen	Upshaw
Fairchild	Klecza	Porter	Valle
Fields	Kline, N. Y.	Pou	Vare
Focht	Kline, Pa.	Pringle	Vestal
Fordney	Knight	Purnell	Voigt
Foster	Kreider	Radcliffe	Volk
Free	Kunz	Rainey, Ala.	Walters
Freeman	Larson, Minn.	Rainey, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Frothingham	Lawrence	Ramsayer	Ward, N. C.
Fulmer	Layton	Ransley	Wason
Funk	Lee, Ga.	Reber	Watson
Gallivan	Lee, N. Y.	Reece	Weaver
Garrett, Tenn.	Leibach	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Gensman	Lineberger	Riddick	White, Me.
Gerner	Lithicum	Riordan	Williams, Tex.
Gifford	Little	Robertson	Williamson
Gilbert	Logan	Rodenberg	Winslow
Glynn	London	Rose	Wise
Goldsborough	Longworth	Rosenbloom	Wood, Ind.
Goodykoontz	Loe	Rossdale	Woodruff
Gorman	Luhning	Rucker	Woods, Va.
Gould	Lyon	Ryan	Woodyard
Graham, Pa.	McDuffie	Sabath	Wyant
Green, Iowa	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.	Yates
Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, N. Y.	
Griest		Schall	

The committee rose; and Mr. McARTHUR having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Hicks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, found itself without a quorum; that he directed the roll to be called, and that 153 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order of no quorum was made three minutes' time remained, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to get excited about this proposition. If we are to preserve the integrity of appropriation bills and the jurisdiction of the committee which deal with legislative propositions, this House can not afford to put on this bill an item of this sort for which there is no legislative authorization. There have been no hearings upon this item, there have been no general demands for it so far as I know. While I am in entire sympathy with these publications, in a regular and orderly way, after consideration by a committee, it does not seem to me that this is the proper place to consider a proposition of this kind. The rules of the House provide that no direction shall be made, and the law itself provides that no direction shall be made for the printing of publications without the submission of an estimate of the cost of that printing, and had I recalled that fact when the question about the point of order was under consideration I think the Chair would have recognized that this item is subject to the point of order. However, I assume that the Members of the House desire to comply with the law, and will recognize the salutary character of the provision which requires that matters of this sort shall be considered by a committee, and that there shall be an estimate by the Government Printer as to the cost.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. My understanding is that the Chair has held that this is in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not arguing the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I hardly see the justice of the criticism that the matter should be considered by another committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that any item that comes before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union ought to have the prior consideration of some committee of the House, which this has not had, and, in view of that fact, it seems to me that the House ought to reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were—ayes 60, noes 41.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. Jones of Texas and Mr. ANDERSON to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL FOREST LANDS.

For the acquisition of additional lands at headwaters of navigable streams, to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., 961), as amended, \$450,000.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The policy of the Federal Government in cooperating with the States in forestation and stream control is a wise policy. For that reason I shall not raise a point of order against this paragraph, but the section of the Weeks Act under which this appropriation is supposed to be in order was repealed by limitation on June 30, 1915. The rest of the Weeks Act is continued in force and effect. The preceding paragraph is in order because section 2 of that act is still the law. Section 3 was repealed by limitation on June 30, 1915. I call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the Agricultural appropriation bill to this fact, and also the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. If it is to be the policy of the Government to continue this appropriation, legislation should be had. Under the original act \$1,000,000 was made available during the years 1910 and 1911, and not more than \$2,000,000 for succeeding years, as appropriated by Congress, until June 30, 1915, at which time section 3 was definitely repealed by limitation explicitly provided in the act.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, \$46,500.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 25, page 71, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Field station, Woodward, Okla.: For the maintenance in connection with the Woodward, Okla., field station of a live-stock department through which experiments and demonstrations in live-stock breeding and growing and feeding, including both beef and dairy animals, may be had, \$6,500."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this has been represented to me as a very important matter, and I only learned of its being left out of the bill through the good offices of my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, after the bill had already been brought into consideration by the House. On the next day I received a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce of Woodward, Okla., expressing great disappointment at the proposed suspension of this service, telling me of the good work being done and of the disadvantages that might result by abolishing this station. This live-stock branch of the station was only established in 1921, a little more than a year ago. Since that time the city of Woodward, Okla., has invested \$15,000 in land for this enterprise, and now it is proposed here to abolish the matter and cut it off just as it is beginning to function to an advantage, thereby breaking faith with the city of Woodward and with the farmers in that section, who are interested in the tests and experiments being made.

I find by consulting the hearings that this is the only station in the United States carrying out a certain character of experiments in cattle feeding, and tests are being made both of dairy production and meat production by grazing cattle on winter

wheat. The importance of continuing this work must certainly be apparent to every Member of this body who knows anything about stock raising and farming, and will certainly be considered of great importance by those now engaged in that line of business.

The importance of the work was admitted in the hearings by those speaking for the bureau, and even our friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], while stating that he had been opposed to the establishment of the station, if I mistake not, admitted in the hearings that it might serve a useful purpose if continued; but for some reason the gentleman seems to have permitted a good intention to go awry. In fact, the only reason given for the suspension of this service was that of Mr. LARSEN of Georgia saying that it was in pursuance of the policy of rigid economy. Certainly if this were the absolute truth we might submit to having this item stricken out of the bill; but with it ought to go a great many other items of less value, such as the item discussed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEPHENS] yesterday for some investigation in distillation of wood, and other purposes which are of doubtful value to the farmers and producers of this country. Yet this item, carrying an appropriation of \$350,000, was retained in the bill by a majority of this committee. From the best information I can obtain, I have no doubt in the world that this service renders a splendid and useful purpose, a great deal better than that served by a great many other items in the bill, and, I am sure, will be taken advantage of to a great deal larger extent by the farmers and stock raisers of the country. The item should be reinstated, and I hope the committee will take that view of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

ENFORCEMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the packers and stockyards act, approved August 15, 1921, \$410,500: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$5,000 per annum except three persons at a rate not to exceed \$6,500 each per annum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on this paragraph I move to strike out the last word in order to ask some questions. I would like to ask why it is necessary to pay three employees in this bureau as much as \$6,500 a year salary?

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman has reference to the item on page 79?

Mr. BLANTON. The top of page 79. It occurs to me that we are providing rather large salaries. Six thousand five hundred dollars salary per year is high for these three employees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, that is a very large job. The packers do not hesitate to pay \$50,000 and \$75,000 to their people.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and therefore, Q. E. D., every employee of the Government should receive as much as a private corporation pays their employees?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I do not think so; but I think this is a very large job. I had a little to do with the drafting of the act, and I think we handed them a pretty hard job. I think we ought to have very efficient men to enforce that act.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman tell us what these particular three men do?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think they have but one \$6,500 man now as far as my recollection goes.

Mr. BLANTON. But we are here providing for three to draw \$6,500 each. Some of our expert scientists in this department are still drawing \$4,000 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Some are drawing a good deal more than that.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of them are bureau chiefs at the head of bureaus and are yet drawing only \$4,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman asks me, I think it is a shame they are.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I think our experts ought to be paid more; but some of these \$6,500 and \$7,500 fellows ought to be reduced because some of them are not valuable expert scientists.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is asking about these \$6,500 men. I think I have the information here. One assistant to the Secretary, who is in charge of the entire enforcement act, draws \$6,500 now.

Mr. BLANTON. That is probably not too much, but how about the other two?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is only one other, and he is consulting specialist in marketing.

Mr. BLANTON. Why then provide another at \$6,500?

Mr. ANDERSON. We always have to leave them a little leeway because, you know, unless there is some opportunity for advancement in Government service, as there is in private employment, it is difficult to get satisfactory men.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, in this instance I will not oppose the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May I ask the gentleman in the time of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I ask for two minutes in order to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I simply want to ask whether practically all of these employees are selected under the civil-service system?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; practically all of them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is true also in regard to the next paragraph relating to the enforcement of the grain futures act?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So far as salaries are concerned I think they are very modest.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAXIMUM SALARIES.

During the fiscal year 1924 the maximum salary of any scientific investigator, or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriation of the Department of Agriculture, shall not exceed at the rate of \$6,500 per annum: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1924 no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of \$5,000 except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of \$5,000 but not in excess of \$5,500 each and not more than five in excess of \$5,500 each.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and a change of existing law in that it increases the amount that may be paid for scientific salaries up to \$6,500 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order? I do not want to take up the time of the committee to plead with the gentleman if he is going to be adamant on this proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is too much as a general proposition. Whenever they have had a reason for it they come in and ask for it and the committee is liberal with them, but just to give them general authorization to increase and jump the salary up to \$6,500 a year, why, there is no telling how much money it might require of the Appropriations Committee in the future.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; this does not do it. It limits the number that can be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON: Page 79, after line 18, insert: "The President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress, to be held in the United States during the year 1923: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted or used for the expenses of delegates."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, this provision has been carried very frequently in an appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the usual provision authorizing the President to invite delegates representing the nations participating in the International Congress. Such an item has been carried almost every year in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and though it is probably outside of the rules of the House I think there will be no objection to it. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperative construction of rural post roads: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended, \$29,300,000, to be available until expended, being part of the sum of \$65,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, by paragraph 1 of section 4 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 19, 1922: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, immediately upon the passage of this act, to apportion among the several States, as provided in section 21 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9,

1921, the sum of \$65,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, by said paragraph 1 of section 4 of the act approved June 19, 1922: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall act upon projects submitted to him under his apportionment of this authorization, and his approval of any such project within three years shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its proportional contribution thereto.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CABLE. I would like to ask the chairman in charge of the bill about the appropriation of \$50,000 that was carried in the law for 1922 for road purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. That authorization will be taken care of, I understand, in the deficiency bill.

Mr. CABLE. When will that bill be reported out of committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand in a few days.

Mr. CABLE. That money will be available for contracts entered into between the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. ANDERSON. It will be available for contract obligations for the current fiscal year, \$50,000,000.

Mr. CABLE. It will take care of all contracts for the current fiscal year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; so I understand.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I made a few remarks yesterday on the public-roads program. They did not get into the RECORD last night. I ask unanimous consent that they be put in the RECORD in the appropriate place on the roads item today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may print the statement which he made yesterday in regard to the public-roads program in its appropriate place in to-day's proceedings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the remarks referred to:

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to my colleagues on this side of the House that when we commenced the fight for the \$50,000,000 appropriation for roads for the fiscal year ending June 30 next, there had not at that time been any provision whatever made to appropriate any of that money or to cover matured obligations. Since that time the deficiency subcommittee has had a hearing and they have come to a clear and complete understanding. The deficiency subcommittee will bring in a bill carrying \$25,000,000 of that, and perpetuating the authorization for a period of three years, with legislation on it to which the Committee on Rules agrees. And secondly, it makes available \$42,000,000 now lying idle in the Treasury, not contracted for by the States. That, with the money carried in this bill, will make \$98,000,000 that will then be available to meet the obligations of the good-roads movement. They used \$88,000,000 last year, and \$78,000,000 the year before, and in my judgment \$98,000,000 will be amply sufficient for the coming year. Many of these obligations under contracts let under the \$50,000,000 appropriation of this year will mature by March, and if the deficiency bill carries an appropriation of \$50,000,000 it will be then available. If the \$50,000,000 is carried in this bill it will not be available until June 30, and therefore some of the States would have to wait until then before the money is available.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DOWELL. I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The Chair wants to remind the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] that in reading the bill we passed over without prejudice a paragraph on page 2, beginning with line 3, and ending with line 7 on page 3.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that we may return to this paragraph now and consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph indicated and consider it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request that was made.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the two paragraphs beginning on page 2, "Office of the Secretary," and ending on line 10 of page 3, be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the paragraphs beginning on page 2, "Office of the Secretary," and ending on line 10 of page 3, be agreed to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk have authority to change the totals in accordance with the action of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request of yesterday that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD an article from the latest edition of the Scientific American which, in my judgment, contains an unanswerable defense of the contention I have heretofore made, that we ought to continue the congressional free-seed distribution. When I made the request yesterday it was in the heat of debate, and the objection was interposed by gentlemen who disagree with me on this question but who are now convinced that I am at least entitled to this courtesy. The article will not occupy more than a couple of pages or a page and a half of the RECORD, and the discussion is so amplifying and so complete that even those who are opposed to what they term this "garden-seed graft" could not object to it. The objection that was interposed at the time, I have since been advised, was interposed under a misapprehension of the facts, and I am sure there will be no objection now to my renewed request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks further in the RECORD by inserting the article from the Scientific American to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the article referred to from the Scientific American. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

[From the Scientific American, December, 1922.]

MILLIONS IN FOOD FROM FEDERAL FREE SEED—THE STORY OF 240,000 ACRES OF GARDENS AND \$192,000,000 WORTH OF VEGETABLES.

(By George H. Dacy.)

Through his Congressmen, Uncle Sam annually gives away approximately 65,000,000 packages of vegetable and flower seed—the best seeds of their type and variety which are to be had in the world. All the Government free seed is tested for germination and truthness of type before it is disseminated among the amateur and professional gardeners, farmers, and suburbanites here, there, and everywhere throughout the United States. Ever since the inception of Uncle Sam's annual free-seed party commercial dealers and the general public have ridiculed the free Federal seed as cheap, impure, and generally "no account." Despite this, the demands for the free seed have increased. Our Representatives and Senators are swamped with applications for the large franked envelopes, each of which contain five packets of certain combinations of seed. The gardeners have tried out the seed and found it the best they ever used. They come back for more each season because they know that the only source from which they can obtain such superior seed is the Department of Agriculture.

The hives of the busiest bees look like centers of idleness as compared with the Government seed warehouse during the period from October to April each year, when the work of sampling, testing, packeting, enveloping, franking, and mailing the millions of congressional orders for seed is progressing at full speed. It is a well-planned orderly journey that the seed travels, from the gunny sack in which it came from the seed dealer to the franked package in which it is sent out by a Congressman to one of his rural constituents. There is no lost motion. The operations are all standardized and systematized. As far as possible mechanical appliances have been substituted for hand labor. One hundred and fifty girls and women are employed. They operate simple and efficient machines which expedite the rapid transfer of the tested seed from large sacks to small paper packets and finally to the mailing of five packets of the seed in one large franked envelope to the ultimate user.

For many years the Department of Agriculture has been opposed to the congressional seed project, as it is called. The Federal farming experts claim that the \$360,000, which yearly is spent in buying seed and sending it to all sections of the country, could better be expended in securing from foreign countries new and rare seeds and cuttings of plants which appear to be adapted for cultivation under our climatic and soil conditions. But annually Congress overrides the recommendations of the department and adds the free-seed item to the agricultural budget in answer to the hundreds of thousands of letters which pour in from the highlands of Appalachia, the wildernesses of Maine, the deserts of Arizona, the cut-over lands of Wisconsin and Michigan, and where not in the United States. Our Federal lawmakers always reserve five-sixths of the seed for distribution among their constituents. The remainder is allotted to the Department of Agriculture as an emergency seed supply which may be given to regions where weather conditions have been severe to the extent that their original quotas of free seed did not germinate.

As matters stand at present, each Congressman is entitled to 20,000 packets of vegetable seed and 2,000 packages of flower seed which he can distribute among the gardeners of his district. Needless to say, all the national lawmakers avail themselves to the full limit of their available quotas of seed. In fact, the Department of Agriculture has to keep a very accurate set of books on the seed debits and credits of each Representative or Senator. At the beginning of the annual seed distribution, each Congressman is credited with his just proportion of the Government seed on the books of the Department of Agriculture. Henceforward he is permitted to draw against this quota as if it were a bank account until his allotment of seed is exhausted. The persistence with which Congressmen try to overdraw their accounts indicates the great popularity of the officially inspected and guaranteed garden seed which Uncle Sam gives away.

Banks, merchants, and agricultural clubs the country over which have aided the respective Congressmen in the distribution of their seeds have kept tab on the resultant returns in the way of foodstuffs which emanate from this generosity of the Government. The average of innumerable reports shows that the representative acre of garden planted with Federal free seed yields at least \$800 worth of food-

stuffs. A leading bank of Grand Rapids, Mich., reports acre yields of vegetables worth \$1,200 from the free seed gardens under its patronage. Last year more than 240,000 acres were planted with Government seed, which demonstrates a food production worth \$192,000,000. It's a pretty good investment that Uncle Sam makes in his farm and garden seed donations. He spends \$360,000 in buying and distributing the seed and the gardeners grow \$192,000,000 worth of vegetables and truck crops. If any other Government or private philanthropy in the country in a single year can yield a return five hundred and thirty-three and three-tenths times as great as the initial investment, the writer would like to know about it. Even under the worst possible conditions, where one-third of each packet of seed was wasted, damaged in transit or otherwise injured so as to prevent germination, a return of at least \$10 per packet of seed in food products has resulted from the averages compiled from 20 years of accurate records kept by Uncle Sam.

Those who use the Federal seed from Maine to Florida and from California to Pennsylvania by the hundreds of thousands endorse it as much better seed than they are ever able to buy on the local markets. The Government seeds germinate well and grow and produce bumper yields of vegetable crops. "Government seeds are the only ones on which I can always rely," writes a gardener from Mississippi. A Representative from Texas, who last year personally made a garden and grew vegetables, reports that his Federal seed gave excellent results, germinating well, and being admirably adapted to the climate of the Lone Star State. A school girl from a corn-belt State last season raised \$20 worth of fine vegetables from one of the small packets of Government seed. An amateur gardener in Providence, R. I., produced \$50 worth of vegetable from his large envelope of Government seeds. He won a prize offered by the local merchants' association for the best home garden. A couple of old-timers in Hamilton, Ohio, won a \$50 prize from their backyard garden, the superiority of which they attribute to Uncle Sam's faultless seed. Enthusiastic endorsements of the free seed has come in hundreds of letters from Detroit automobile mechanics and cotton-mill employees of the South, as much seed is annually distributed among the working forces of such establishments.

Approximately 30 different combinations of seed have been worked out which are adapted to production in different sections of the country. For example, some of the vegetables which will flourish in Florida will fail in Minnesota. The superintendent of seed distribution studies the orders of each Congressman and makes sure that combinations of seed are sent out which are propitiously adapted to cultivation in the section of the country where the seed are destined for distribution. Naturally, city residents can not plant vegetable seed unless they have back yards. However, most of them can put out window boxes seeded with flower seed. Hence there is a special proviso by which Congressmen can exchange a certain proportion of their vegetable seed for flower seed for distribution in congested city sections.

In addition to being tested for germination, all the Government seeds are tested for trueness of type and name by planting some of them in the gardens of Uncle Sam's big experimental crop farm at Arlington, Va. All seed that does not germinate up to Federal requirements is rejected, while if any dealers provide seed which is not true to name they are blacklisted and boycotted so far as potential national purchases are concerned. Just to illustrate that this factor is one of crucial importance, it is worthy of mention that there are more than 1,600 different types of lettuce, 2,000 different varieties of radishes, and 1,800 different kinds of beans grown and sold commercially throughout the United States. American seedsmen catalogue this number of varieties; and although Uncle Sam does not recognize all of them officially, he has to know them and their aliases in order to determine what sections of the country they are adapted to. It is especially notable that during the last score of years, during which Uncle Sam annually has distributed from 100,000 to 1,500,000 pounds of seeds, the official tests of the Federal free seed have averaged over 89 per cent—a record altogether remarkable. During the past 20 years between 30,000 and 50,000 pounds of Government flower seed have been circulated among the public each year. Opponents of the free-seed distribution measure yearly raised a great hullabaloo concerning the large post-office deficit that results from the fact that the free seed is sent out under congressional franks. These contentions are wholly unfounded. Records kept by the Department of Agriculture show that during the last 20 years the average cost of handling the Government seed if it were distributed by a retail seedsmen would have ranged from \$55,000 to \$180,000 a year, with the average about \$110,000. This includes the true cost of postage on the basis of the actual weights of the large and small packages of seed. This would at best be but a small item to the Post Office Department. Furthermore, the system of handling the seed has been so standardized that the labors of the Federal mail service are reduced to a minimum.

The seed packages have to be prepared and circulated on a rush-order, full-pressure schedule. By law it is required that no seed be put into the mails before December 1 and that the distribution of seed by Congressmen be completed by April 1. The Secretary of Agriculture is allowed the special privilege of sending out free seed up to April 15. During a short period of four months—on the basis of current activities—65,000,000 packets of seed placed in 13,000,000 of the large franked envelopes have to be put into the mails. The inception and perfection of mechanical hands to expedite this work have been of immeasurable importance.

The Post Office Department keeps from 5 to 12 clerks at the Government seed warehouse during the mailing season sorting and routing the Government franks—the substitute postage stamps—into the different towns and villages over the United States. This system eliminates much laborious work in handling the packages of seeds in the official post offices. For example, if Senator X, of Georgia, desires to send 1,000 large packages of seed to political supporters of his in the town of Stark the franks are prepared and viséed by the postal clerks at the seed warehouse. Then they are passed on to the large manila envelopes, which in turn are filled with the desired combination of seed. When the packages are finally counted and placed in the mail bags they are ready to go directly to the mail train which will convey them to their destination. The same number of postal clerks can handle twenty times as many packages in this way as they can of ordinary unassorted commercial packages. An ordinary mail pouch will hold 200 packages of Government seed. It takes 65,000 mail bags to carry the free-seed supply from Washington to the localities where the gardens will be planted.

Gravity is harnessed as much as possible in aiding the big job of packing the seeds in paper envelopes. On the fourth floor of the seed warehouse there are 22 galvanized iron hoppers, each holding about 4 bushels of seed. These feed seed to as many packets and sealing

machines on the floor below. Mr. Frank Clarke, of Waco, Tex., the contractor in charge of the packing, sealing, and delivery of the seed packages during the current year, has invented a very ingenious sealing machine, which has vastly aided in speeding up the work. Formerly it used to take three girls who worked by hand all day to fill and seal up 16,000 of the small packets. Now two girls working with a machine can fill and seal an average of 30,000 to 35,000 packages in a similar period. The record day's work has been 48,200 packages by two girls who worked at top speed and filled and sealed at the rate of over 100 packages a minute. One of the girls sits in front of a delivery tube provided with a revolving adjustable cup that deposits exactly the same amount of seed into each package. The other girl feeds the packets of seed (ranging in size from 8 to 1,200 to the pound) into the gluing and sealing machine. This machine consists of an endless belt provided with a series of cleats spaced to fit the different sized packets. It is operated by electricity. In turn, the packets are slipped into the spaces on the moving belt and carried under an automatic device consisting of a brass wheel which applies glue to the flaps and then under another special contrivance which folds over these flaps and presses them tightly so that the glue adheres and seals the containers. As the belt reaches the end of the machine and begins its downward and backward journey, each packet in turn is delivered to a large basket. When the basket is full, an attendant replaces it with an empty receptacle and dumps the filled container through a chute in the floor to a bin. There are as many different chutes and bins as there are different kinds of seed.

Altogether there are 64 of these V-shaped seed bins, which are large enough to accommodate 50,000,000 packets of seed. The 14 vegetables include beans, corn, peas, watermelons, cucumbers, squash, parsley, lettuce, onions, radishes, turnips, tomatoes, carrots, and beets. About 30 different combinations of these seeds are sent out. There are 10 different kinds of flower seed, including nasturtiums, sweet peas, petunias, poppies, mignonette, asters, cosmos, and the like.

On the second floor of the seed warehouse there are five large endless belts, each of which is manned by a crew of nine girls. Chutes from the seed bins above distribute the different kinds of seed, respectively, before certain of these girls who feed the small packets of seed into the large envelopes which are carried along the belt. For example, the combination of seed may consist of beans, corn, peas, beets, and lettuce. The franked envelope starts from the tables where girls paste the franks onto the proper envelopes. There it passes on belts to the next post, where the girl puts in it a packet of corn. The next girl slips in a packet of peas, the next one beets, and so on, until all five of the required packets of seeds are placed in the envelope. Then it passes before another girl who inspects the package to see that it contains the right kind and number of seed packets. The final operator runs the machine that glues and folds the envelope flap. The large packages are delivered into baskets which are dumped onto tables before inspectors who count and check the packages and deposit them into the mail sacks, whence they go direct to the railroad.

The five conveyor belts handle 125,000 large packages or 625,000 small packets of seed daily. The day's record for any belt is 36,600 packages or 183,000 small packets of seed. The belt operates at a speed which carries 84 of the cleated spaces for the envelopes before each girl a minute. These large belts travel a combined distance of 2,555 miles in packaging and preparing the free seed for distribution. If placed end to end, the 65,000,000 packets of seed distributed during 1922 would cover a distance of 3,551 miles, or about one-seventh of the distance around the world.

And that is the story behind those large envelopes of seeds which come to us in response to our request.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. TOWNER as Speaker pro tempore having assumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that a vote was not to be taken on the passage of any bill until January 3.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has reported, and the Speaker pro tempore has announced the report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. The consideration of the bill in committee is concluded.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the House do now adjourn.

EXERCISES IN MEMORY OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE KINKAID.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. I will withhold it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I understand that January 14 has been designated as the date for memorial exercises in honor of our late colleague, the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois. I have conferred with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], upon whose request this order was made, and I find it perfectly agreeable to him and to the Nebraska delegation that exercises in memory of the Hon. MOSES P. KINKAID, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, be had on that day immediately after the memorial exercises in

honor of Mr. MANN have been concluded. I ask that an order to that effect be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30 REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Whereas Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, deceased, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept such devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Therefore be it Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

Senate Joint Resolution 218, to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3220. An act amending sections 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, 19, 29, and 30 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13571) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 13572) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office building to be erected at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13573) to determine proceedings in cases of contested elections of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13574) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Pierre, S. Dak., to commemorate the explorations and discoveries of the Verendrye brothers, and to expend not to exceed \$25,000 therefor; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13575) to provide seed wheat for the drought-stricken area in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13576) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Wray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 13577) granting a pension to Ella Kinser Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13578) granting a pension to George H. Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13579) for the relief of Thomas F. Madden; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6678. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of K. Jacobs and 80 other residents of Pontiac, Mich., protesting against Turkish atrocities and requesting the Federal Government to initiate measures to restrain further violence in this respect; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6679. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Bronx Board of Trade, in the city of New York, N. Y., urging a central post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6680. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 42 residents of the State of California, favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6681. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Mr. Lyle L. Putney and 13 other residents of Arcadia, Mich., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 27, 1922.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast cared for us through the night season and hast granted us health and strength for the day and its duties. We look unto Thee this morning, asking that Thy guidance may be had and that every phase of life as presented to us may receive that kind consideration, that we may become more helpful in these days of need and of manifold problems, and finally receive Thine approbation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MEDILL McCORMICK, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ARIZONA.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], which have just been received. I ask that they may be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, HENRY F. ASHURST was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at the city of Phoenix, the capital, this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

By the acting governor:

ERNEST R. HALL.

JOHN MCK. REDMOND,
Assistant Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], certified by the governor, and ask to have the same read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows: